STUDIES IN TAMIL LITERATURE AND HISTORY

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

1. Hindu Administrative Institutions.
2. The Mauryan Polity.
3. Some Aspects of the Vayu Purana.
4. The Matsya Purana: A Study.
5. Silappadikaram (in the Press).

STUDIES IN TAMIL LITERATURE AND HISTORY

BY

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR, M.A.,
Lecturer in Indian History, University of Madras.



UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS.

1936.

First Published 1930

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE, MADRAS

PREFACE.

'Studies in Tamil Literature and History' was first published in 1930 by Messrs. Luzac & Co., London. The book went out of print in the beginning of this year. In view of this and also of the fact that it is prescribed for study by candidates taking Tamil at the Intermediate Arts examination at the University of London, the Secretary, External Department, University of London, wrote to me asking whether I am reprinting the book. This and the increasing demand for the book made me approach the University of Madras with the request to help me in the publication of a second edition of the book. And the University has been kind enough to undertake to reprint it, for which I express my grateful thanks.

In this edition I have added in an Appendix some notes which are the results of further studies on the subjects discussed in the book.

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS,
14th December, 1936.

PREFATORY NOTE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

To the earnest student of Indian History and particularly of South Indian History, a deep and critical study of ancient Tamil literature is of the utmost importance. The necessity for such study came home to me strongly in 1923 when I was nominated to a Research Studentship of the University of Madras. In the course of the investigation on the subject of *Hindu Administrative Institutions* I felt more and more the need for an intensive study of the priceless literary treasures of Tamil. Hence I devoted my leisure hours to a study of Tamil literature, and the results of such study were a series of six articles on the Mystic Poets of the Tamil Land which appeared in the *Hindu* during 1924 and 1925, one article on the *Art of War as practised in South India* in the *Annals of Bhandarkar Research Institute*, Poona, one on *Tantrayukti* to the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras and three on Tamil Social Life in the *Hindu Illustrated Weekly*. Lastly on the suggestion of Professor P. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar, I prepared a monograph on a comparative study of the *Tirukkuṛaḷ* and Sanskrit literature, of which a portion has appeared in his *History of the Tamils*.

The present volume is a collection of these stray writings together with the results of further studies on the subject. The first chapter is devoted to an examination of the Śaṅgam age, and of the Śaṅgam works so-called. I have attempted to prove that the Śaṅgam is not a myth. In the second and third chapters a biographical sketch of some of the celebrated Śaṅgam poets and Mystic poets is attempted. The fourth chapter is a study of the life and times of the author of the *Tirukkuṛaḷ*, and the latter portion of it is devoted to an examination of the parallel ideas to be found in the Sanskrit *nīti* works.

The last three chapters of the book deal with the political and social organization of the ancient Tamil Land as can be gathered from the literature itself. The first chapter is on Administrative Institutions such as kingship, council, administration of taxation and justice. Though the materials are too meagre to attempt anything like a history of the institutions, still I have endeavoured to make the best use of them. The next chapter is on the institution of war, organization of the army and navy, and international relations, as the materials available for such study are ample. The last chapter is on the life of the people—their urban and rural life, their chief pastimes, their skill in and appreciation of the fine arts such as music and dancing, their marriage customs, and their simple festivals. In the examination of these details in respect of social and political organizations, I have confined myself to the Śaṅgam works, and whenever a reference is made to later works like the *Tēvāram* or the *Divyaprabandam*, it is only to show how tradition persists in this ancient land.

My thanks are due to the editors of the *Hindu* and the *Annals of Bhandarkar Research Institute* for permitting me to utilize the articles which have appeared in their columns, to Sriman K. Ramaratna Ayyar, B.A. and Pandit M. Raghava Ayyangar for suggesting several improvements in the manuscript, to Professors K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and V. Rangacharya for going through the manuscript and giving me much valuable advice, to Mr. S. Anavaratavinayagam Pillai, Reader in Tamil, Madras University, Mr. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, Editor of the *Tamil Lexicon* and Dr. P. S. Subramaniya Sastri, Assistant Editor for offering useful suggestions when the work was in the press, and to the Syndicate of the University of Madras for having kindly permitted me to publish this book.

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.

MADRAS,
September 25, 1930.

CONTENTS

The last three chapters of the book deal with the political and social organization of the ancient Tamil Land as can be gathered from the literature itself. The first chapter is on Administrative Institutions such as kingship, council, administration of taxation and justice. Though the materials are too meagre to attempt anything like a history of the institutions, still I have endeavoured to make the best use of them. The next chapter is on the institution of war, organization of the army and navy, and international relations, as the materials available for such study are ample. The last chapter is on the life of the people—their urban and rural life, their chief pastimes, their skill in and appreciation of the fine arts such as music and dancing, their marriage customs, and their simple festivals. In the examination of these details in respect of social and political organizations, I have confined myself to the Śaṅgam works, and whenever a reference is made to later works like the *Tēvāram* or the *Divyaprabandam*, it is only to show how tradition persists in this ancient land.

My thanks are due to the editors of the *Hindu* and the *Annals of Bhandarkar Research Institute* for permitting me to utilize the articles which have appeared in their columns, to Sriman K. Ramaratna Ayyar, B.A. and Pandit M. Raghava Ayyangar for suggesting several improvements in the manuscript, to Professors K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and V. Rangacharya for going through the manuscript and giving me much valuable advice, to Mr. S. Anavaratavinayagam Pillai, Reader in Tamil, Madras University, Mr. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, Editor of the *Tamil Lexicon* and Dr. P. S. Subramaniya Sastri, Assistant Editor for offering useful suggestions when the work was in the press, and to the Syndicate of the University of Madras for having kindly permitted me to publish this book.

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.

MADRAS,
September 25, 1930.

CONTENTS

NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION AND DIACRITICAL MARKS

Generally the phonetical method is followed in transliteration

Long vowels are indicated thus : ā, ē

c	represents	च, ś श, ṣ ष
ḍ	,,	ड ṭ ट
ḷ	,,	ள்
ḻ	,,	ழ்
ṇ	,,	ண்
ṉ	,,	ன்
ñ	,,	ஞ்
ṅ	,,	ங்
ṟ	,,	ற்

CHAPTER I

THE ŚAṄGAM

Sec. I. INTRODUCTORY

It is evident that an invaluable mine of information is found buried in the huge mass of Dravidian and especially Tamil literature for reconstructing the history of the ancient Tamil land. And there is also evidence to demonstrate that this plant of Tamil literature shot up, of course gradually, into a huge tree with various branches containing fruits and flowers, under the sympathetic and distinguished patronage of the kings of those good old days. It is claimed by the supporters of tradition that the institution of an Academy designated in later literature as Śaṅgam flourished for thousands of years with its seat in the capitals of the Pāṇḍya country, the latest of which was Madura. Under such distinguished auspices as the direct assistance rendered by all the Tamil kings including the Cōḻas and the Cēras, the fruitful literature of classical type grew and grew to a lofty extent. The geographical region where the Tamil literature continued to flourish is furnished to us by many of the commentators of the *Tolkāppiyam*. According to this testimony[1] that territory was bound by the river Vaigai in the south, the river Marudam in the north, Karuvūr in the west and Maruvūr in the east. Put briefly, this would include portions of not only the Pāṇḍya kingdom but also portions of the Cōḻa and the Cēra kingdoms. Need there be, then, any doubt for the conclusion that the Tamil literature was richly patronized by the then South Indian Kings?

[1] See the gloss of Iḷampūraṇar, Sēṇāvaraiyar, and Naccinārkkiṉiyar on the *sūtra* 398, *Solladikāram*.

Sec. II. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The chief source of information is the continuous tradition as embodied in the Tamil literary works of an original character. The next source covers the vast field of commentaries, some of which are well authenticated. There are also other sources, which are, however, secondary in character inasmuch as they refer to incidents connected with this particular institution, but not directly. Under this head come, the accounts of Western geographers some of whom visited this land and recorded their observations. There were others who have left records compiled from such notes and observations left by such visitors. Among these figure the invaluable works like the *Periplus,* Ptolemy's Geography and that of Pliny. Again the Ceylon tradition as embedded in the *Mahāvaṁśa,* the *Rājāvali* and the *Rājaratnākari* come under this category.[1] The inscriptional evidence is also to be treated as a secondary source of information inasmuch as the information is meagre. Last but not least, is the reference in contemporary and post-contemporary Sanskrit literature. Thus the sources of information are six in number. While the first two alone are valuable inasmuch as they transmit tradition, the other lines of evidence are useful only so far as they corroborate, to some extent, the legendary names and places.

Tamil Literary Works.—Among the Tamil literary works which make mention of the term Śaṅgam in the sense of a 'lay royal academy' prominently figures the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam.* The extant *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇams* are two in number, the older and the later. The authorship of the older work is

[1] See *Sacred Books of Ceylon,* vols. i and ii (London).

attributed to Perumbaṟṟappuliyūr Nambi and the work may be chronologically fixed in the twelfth century A.D. The later work is the composition of Parañjōtimuṉivar and may roughly date from the sixteenth century. It may be noted in passing, that another version of this work also exists in Sanskrit called *Hālāsya Māhātmya*. This work contains a number of stories containing miracles attributed to Lord Śiva enshrined in the temple at Madura. Though the work is a composition of much later times, still much of the matter it contains, especially the legendary portions, seems to have been current in much earlier times, at least earlier than the sixth century A.D. We shall revert to the legend contained in this work in the sequel. The other literary works which mention the term Śaṅgam in the technical sense of 'an assembly of the classical school' are the *Tēvāram* (seventh century A.D.) where Appar swāmigaḷ refers to one poor Darumi who won a prize in the Academy.[1]

The very fact that the great Śaiva Samayācārya Tirugñāna Sambandar[2] and Vaiṣṇava ācāryas like Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār in the *Periyatirumoḻi* (iii. 4-10 and 9-10)[3] and Āṇḍāḷ the great Vaiṣṇava mystic poetess in the *Tiruppāvai*[4] speak of *Śaṅga-t-tamiḻ*, shows that by the time of these ācāryas, roughly from the commencement of the sixth century, the sun of the classical school of Tamil had set. The Tamil language entered on a new phase

[1] 'நன்பாட்டுப் புலவனாய்ச் சங்கமேறி நற்கனகக் கிழிதருமிக் கருளினோன் காண்.' Tirunāvu-Tirupputtūr—Tiruttāṇ, 3.

[2] *Tēvāram*, p. 1179—Swāminātha Paṇḍitar Ed.

Here the term *Maduraittokai* (மதுரைத்தொகை) is translated as *sangha* by Sēkkiḻār, *Periya Purāṇam*, Tirugñānasambandamūrti Nāyaṉār Purāṇam, st. 843.

This is very important as it shows that *tokai* means the academy, and not the mere technical sense in which the *Daṇḍi Alaṅkāram* uses it.

different from the earlier classical type. It is then plausible to postulate a theory that the period, namely, the end of the fifth century marked the extinction of the Academy as the writers of the time conceived it. We know from later events that the Academy died hard. According to the tradition transmitted by the *Guruparamparai* of both *Teṅgalai* and *Vaḍagalai* versions,[1] a legendary story is told of how the *Tiruvāymoḻi* got approved by the Madura Śaṅgam. It is said that one of the Āḻvārs and a devoted student of Nammāḻvār, Madurakavi built a temple in the village of Tirunagari and established the image of his guru, Nammāḻvār. When a festival was arranged to be celebrated in his honour, a strong opposition came from the then members of the Academy at Madura. At this time 300 poets adorned the assembly. They wanted the *Tiruvāymoḻi* to be approved before a festival was held in honour of its author. When this was known, Madurakavigaḷ wrote the beginning of a single stanza in the *Tiruvāymoḻi Kaṇṇaṉkaḻaliṇai* (கண்ணன் கழலிணை) on a palm leaf and asked it to be placed in the Śaṅgam plank. No sooner was it deposited than the plank cast off the three hundred poets and accommodated only the leaf containing the single phrase of the *Tiruvāymoḻi*, thus establishing its acceptance and approval. Again, the poet Kambaṉ is said to have received the imprimatur of the Śaṅgam.[2] Further there are distinct references to the Śaṅgam as an Academy in the *Periyapurāṇam*.[3] There is again the recently published *Takkayāgapparaṇi* of *Oṭṭakkūttar*. Here the first line of the stanza 714 runs as follows[4] :—

சங்க மெங்கள் குழைவில் லெமது சக்ர மெமதே

[1] Pinpaḻākiya Perumāḷjīyar, pp. 64-6. [2] Saḍagōpar antāti, st. 48.
[3] See for instance Tirugñānasambandamūrti Nāyaṉār Purāṇam, st. 843.
[4] P. 233 ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar (1930).

The Commentaries.—The other equally valuable source of information consists of the learned glosses left to us as a rich legacy by our illustrious ancestors. The first rank is offered to the legend of the Śaṅgam as narrated in the commentary of the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ,* the latter popularly known as *Kaḷaviyal,* a Grammar of love poetry in sixty *sūtras.* We are not at present concerned with the work itself but with the elaborate gloss on the work. The authorship of this commentary is attributed generally to Nakkīrar.[1] The tradition that Nakkīrar's commentary was handed down orally for ten generations before it was put into writing, certainly leaves room for doubt that some additions might have been made by later hands. On this account, to deny any credit to Nakkīrar's hand in it is not quite convincing. What is more significant is that the celebrated commentator Naccinārkkiniyar follows the account given in the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ* in his commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷadikāram.*[2] In his gloss on the *sūtra* 649 of the *Tolkāppiyam*[3] Pēr-Āśiriyar, equally distinguished, also seems to take the tradition for granted

[1] For a discussion on the subject see M. Rāghava Ayyangar's contribution to the *Sen Tamiḻ,* vol. iv, pp. 303-11. According to this learned Paṇḍit the original gloss of Nakkīrar passed on, according to its own version to ten hands the last being Nīlakaṇṭaṉār. After him it would appear that the extant commentary took its present shape. In this process the hand of Iḷampūraṇar, the well-known commentator, on the *Tolkāppiyam* is evident as is seen from similar passages occurring in both the commentaries.

[2] *Sūtras* 35 and 51 *Tolkāppiyam, Seyyuḷiyal* by Paṇḍit R. Rāghava Ayyangar (1917).

[3] *Sūtra* 649. வினையி னீங்கி விளங்கிய வறிவின்
முனைவன் கண்டது முதனூலாகும்.

In the course of his gloss Pēr-Āśiriyar continues: என்றூர்க்கு முந்துநூ லெனப்பட்டன முற்காலத்து வீழ்ந்தனவெனக் கூறித் தொல்காப்பியர் அகத்தியத்தோடு பிறழவும் அவற்று வழிநூல் செய்தாரென்றக்கால் இழுக்கென்னை யெனின் அது வேதவழக்கோடு மாறுகொள்வார் இக்காலத்துச்சொல்லினும் இறந்தகாலத்துப் பிறபாசண்டிகளும் மூன்றுவகைச் சங்கத்து நான்குவருணத்தோடுபட்ட சான்றோரும் அது கூறாரென்பது . . .

when he refers to the three Academies and members of the three Academies.

The same value is attached by another commentator Aḍiyārkkunallār whose gloss on the *Śilappadikāram* is very well known. From these, one fact emerges. Three commentators of no mean scholarship and repute have unreservedly accepted the version of the commentator on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ.* Though it is easy to dismiss these valuable works as unhistorical and uncritical and hence worthless to students of history, still we cannot afford to credit commentators with such ignorance of the subject which they were handling. When they quote with approval, it means that they were satisfied of the veracity of the tradition behind the account. It also demonstrates how tradition that has grown around the three Śaṅgams has been persistent in the Tamil land. It would be interesting to know what this legend contains and we shall examine it presently. To these may be added the commentary on the stanza 714 of the *Takkayāgapparaṇi* to which we shall have occasion to revert soon.

Among the secondary sources of information the epigraphical evidence is attested by the larger Śinnamannūr plates of the tenth century A.D., an inscription of much importance. The grant is made by Rājasimha,

It is argued from the term '*மூன்றுவகைச் சங்கத்து*' or three kinds of Academies that it refers to *muttamiḻ* or a collection of verses on *Iyal, Iśai* and *Nāṭakam.* But that the commentator did not have this in mind when he referred to it, is seen from a later passage in the same *sūtra:* *சகரர் வேள்விக்குதிரை நாடித் தொட்ட கடலகத்துப்பட்டுக் குமரியாறும் பனைநாட்டோடு கெடுவதற்கு முன்னையதென்பதூஉம் அவ்வழக்குநூல் கண்டு பற்றியல்லது மூன்றுவகைச் சங்கத்தாருஞ் செய்யுட் செய்திலரென்பதூஉம்...*

Here the term: *மூன்றுவகைச் சங்கத்தாரும்* is a significant one and is an unimpeachable reference to the members of the three Academies. Any other construction will be untenable. (See *Tolkāppiyaṃ,* ed. by Diwan Bahadur S. Bavānandam Pillai, vol. iv, p. 589 and ff) ; *contra* V. Nārāyana Ayyar *Jour. Orient. Research,* April, 1928. Article on 'The Śaṅgam Literature.'

the Pāṇḍya king.[1] Here there is a valuable, though casual, reference to the establishment of the Śaṅgam as an organized institution. Most of the inscriptions now available date from roughly A.D. 600 by which time it is probable that the Śaṅgam as an active institution had ceased to exist. Hence they had no occasion to mention it and did not mention it.

Sec. III THE LEGEND

We shall now proceed to narrate the legends contained in the above works with regard to the Śaṅgam and see how far they are supported by other records such as the Ceylonese books, the evidence of travellers, etc.

The following is an account as contained in the commentary on *Iṛaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ*. The Pāṇḍyas founded three Śaṅgams or Academies, the first Academy, the middle Academy and the last Academy. It is said that members who constituted the first Śaṅgam were 549 beginning with Agattiyaṉār (Agastya in Sanskrit). Among others were God Śiva of braided hair who burnt the three cities, Murugaṉ the Hill-God, Muḍināgarāyar of Murañjiyūr and Kubēra, the Lord of Treasure. They say that as many as 4,449 persons composed a number of poems including the *Paripāḍal, Mudunārai, Mudukurugu* and *Kalariyāvirai*. The above persons continued to be members of the Śaṅgam for 4,400 years. They were patronized by eighty-nine kings commencing with Kāysiṉa Vaḷudi to Kaḍuṅgōn. It is also said that seven of these kings were themselves poets. The meeting-place of this Academy was Madura which was afterwards swallowed by the sea. Agattiyam was the grammar followed by them.

The members of the second (middle) Śaṅgam were fifty-nine and some of them were Agastya, Tolkāppiyaṉār,

[1] *S.I.I.*, vol. iii, pt. iv, p. 454.

Irundaiyūr-Karuṅgōli, Mōśi, Vellūrkkāppiyaṉār, Śiṟu-pāṇḍaraṅgaṉ, Tiraiyaṉmāṟaṉ the King of Tuvarai (Dvāraka,) and Kīrandai. It is said that 3,700 persons composed poems including *Kali, Kurugu, Veṇḍāḷi* and *Viyāḻamālai Ahaval*. The *Agattiyam*, the *Tolkāppiyam*, the *Māpurāṇam*, *Iśainuṇukkam*, and *Būdapurāṇam* were their grammars. The duration of the period of this Śaṅgam was 3,700 years. It is said that fifty-nine Pāṇḍyan kings commencing with Veṇḍērśeḻiyaṉ and ending with Muḍattirumāṟaṉ were its patrons. Among these were five poets. The Śaṅgam was located at Kavāṭa-puram. This also was perhaps swallowed by the sea.

The last Śaṅgam consisted of forty-nine members and consisted of Śiṟu Mēdāviyār, Śēndambūdaṉār, Aṟivuḍayaṉār Peruṅkuṉṟūrkkiḻār, Iḷam Tirumāṟaṉ, Nallanduvaṉār, the Madura scholiast, Marudaṉ Iḷanāga-ṉār, Nakkīrar the Schoolmaster's son. Here were presented poems of 449 poets. Some of them were *Neḍuntogai* (Ahanāṉūṟu), *Kuṟuntogai Nāṉūṟu* (four hundred), *Naṟṟiṇai Nāṉūṟu* (four hundred), *Puṟanāṉūṟu*, *Aiṅguṟunūṟu* (five hundred) *Padiṟṟuppattu*, *Kaḷi* (one hundred and fifty), *Paripāḍal* (seventy), *Kūttu*, *Vari*, *Śiṟṟiśai* and *Pēriśai*. They followed the grammars known as the *Agattiyam* and the *Tolkāppiyam*. This Śaṅgam lasted for 1,850 years. Forty-nine were the kings who patronized this Academy commencing with Muḍattiru-māṟaṉ who established his capital at Madura when a portion of his kingdom was devoured by the sea. The last patron of this Academy was Ukkirapperuvaḻudi. The meeting place of the Śaṅgam was the Uttara Madura (North Madura, the modern city of Madura).

The Legend Examined.—In a brochure of his, entitled *Essay on Tamil Literature*,[1] the late Prof. Śēṣagiri

Śāstri remarked: 'With reference to the first two Śaṅgams I may say that the account is too mythical and fabulous to be entitled to any credit and I do not think that any scholar who has studied the histories of the world will be bold enough to admit such tales within the pale of real history. There may have been some truth in the above account as regards government of the Madura kingdom by the Pāṇḍyas, but the number of the kings who are said to have ruled over the kingdom, viz., eighty-nine Pāṇḍyas who are connected with the first Śaṅgam and fifty-nine who are connected with the intervening Śaṅgam is not quite trustworthy and to accept it as a true fact we require some further evidence.' An examination of the legend shows that the late lamented professor was justified in making such observations. There is first, the introduction of Gods of the Hindu Pantheon, such as, Śiva, Muruga, Kubēra, as members of the Śaṅgam thus introducing the element of the supernatural. Secondly these Gods are associated with human poets and poetesses with no distinction whatsoever. Thirdly there is the abnormally lengthy duration of the periods of the Śaṅgam besides the extraordinarily long reigns of the Pāṇḍyan kings. Fourthly, there is the mention of artificial figures which impair very much the authenticity of these accounts. For example, it is said that the first Śaṅgam lasted for 4,440 years and consisted of 4,449 poets. The second covered a period of 3,700 years and the poets of the period were also 3,700. The third Śaṅgam covered a period of 1,850 years and had on its rolls 449 members. Artificiality is evident in its symmetry. The length of the period of each Śaṅgam is a multiple of 37 and the total duration is $37 \times (120 + 100 + 50)$.[1] Fifthly, there is the anachronistic confusion

[1] See P. T. Śrinivāsa Ayyangar, *History of the Tamils*, p. 232.

of assigning one and the same author to different Śaṅgams. As an illustration, we may point out Agattiyaṉār is mentioned in the first two Academies. Either this is wrong or the Agattiyaṉār in the second Śaṅgam was a member belonging to the family of the original Agastya. This alternative explanation would be valid if the theory of the first two Śaṅgams as separate institutions is proved. But this is an improbability.[1]

Sixthly, no works mentioned in the accounts relating to the first two Śaṅgams have come down to us except perhaps the *Tolkāppiyam* which tradition assigns to the second Academy. Lastly while the commentator mentions only three Pāṇḍyas as poets of the last Śaṅgam, the extant Śaṅgam works refer to nine Pāṇḍyan kings besides six Cōḻa chieftains. Thus, what the late Śēṣagiri Śāstriar remarked about the first two Śaṅgams is largely true of the third Academy also. It is however significant to note that members of the Hindu Pantheon are not identified with human poets in the third Academy, and most of the works and names found in the account are authentic as is seen from the extant Śaṅgam works.

The latest writer on the subject, Mr. P. T. Śrinivāsa Ayyangar has drawn attention to some inaccurate statements in the commentary on *Ahapporuḷ* from which he has concluded that the commentator is an unreliable witness.[2] Let us state them categorically and then proceed to examine them seriatim. (1) Numerous poets must have flourished before the age of Agattiyaṉār for him to compose a grammar of literary Tamil and there

[1] A similar instance is that a poem of Muḍiṉāgarāyar a member of the first Academy, finds a place in the *Puṟam* a composition of the third Academy. The same is also true of Vāṉmīkiyār, Mārkaṇḍēyaṉār, and Gōtamaṉār.

[2] *History of the Tamils*, pp. 233-5.

is no reference to the existence of these poets in the commentary. (2) Some poems of the *Puṟam* (31, 33) and other collections of the third Śaṅgam bestow lavish praise on the success of the Cōḻa kings and the defeat of the Pāṇḍyas. Would such poems be included in the anthologies authorized to be made by the kings of Madura? (3) The kings were so often fighting with each other that it must have been impossible for the Madura king to attend to this. (4) The idea of an organized Academy is a very modern one and it is surely a violent anachronism to transfer it to many hundreds of years ago.

In regard to the first argument, it may be urged that the commentator on the *Ahapporuḷ* is engaged in giving an account of the Śaṅgam and not a description of the conditions prior to the Śaṅgam. No preliminary survey of the literary activity before the alleged Śaṅgam period is attempted. From the fact of the mention of an authoritative grammar, it is taken for granted that a body of literature existed before Agastya composed his work on grammar. The absence of reference to the previous works will not detract from the value of the account.

In regard to the second and third arguments, as has been already said, though the headquarters of the Academy was at the Pāṇḍyan capital, still it was richly patronized by all the Tamil chieftains including the Cōḻas and the Cēras. There is no proof to state authoritatively that it was the sole and exclusive privilege of the Pāṇḍyan kings. It was then a common Academy where facts were stated whether it would be acceptable to the sitting monarch or no. The poets of those days always enjoyed the rare privilege of entering any Court and tendering advice to the chieftains whenever they erred from the right path. Would it be too much to assume that Madura was the centre of the then University life to

the growth of which the Cōḻas and the Cēras contributed not a little.[1] The fourth argument that an organized Academy was an impossibility in ancient times, is not convincing. We know from Sanskrit literature that *pariṣads* became common institutions of the epoch of the *Upaniṣads* and the earlier *Dharmasūtras* where learned paṇḍits assembled and entered into discussions. Sometimes these *pariṣads* were presided over by kings of the land. It may be originally there was no Śaṅgam Hall as such and wherever the king held his Court, there was the Śaṅgam. Possibly the institution gained in course of time more importance and a need was felt for a separate establishment. Perhaps it got a permanent footing much later than its commencement as a recognized body.

That an Academy acted as a literary censor of new poems is evident in the case of the *Tolkāppiyam* and the *Tirukkuṟaḷ*. In the *Pāyiram* or prefatory verses to the *Tolkāppiyam*, Paṉambāraṉār, a friend of Tolkāppiyaṉār, refers to an assembly of a Pāṇḍyan king Nilandaru Tiruvir Pāṇḍyan, where the author of the *Tolkāppiyam* presented his work and got it accepted. It is said that a certain Brahman versed in Vedic lore of the village of Adaṅgōḍu sat in judgment over the work.[2] According to Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar the Pāṇḍyan king under whose supervision Tolkāppiyaṉār got the imprimatur was Mākīrti and that this Adaṅgōḍu Brahman put the work to severe criticism against all of which Tolkāppiyaṉār easily defended his work.

Another instance of a publication in a royal Court was that of the *Tirukkuṟaḷ*. According to a legend the

[1] தமிழ்கெழுகூடற் றண்கோல்வேந்தே *Puṟam*, 58. This ode is attributed to Kāvirip-Pūmpaṭṭiṉam Kārikkaṇṇaṉār and celebrates the alliance of both the Cōḻa and the Pāṇḍyan kings.

[2] See *Puṟam*, 224, ll. 9-11 *Maduraikkāñci*, ll. 60-61.

Kuṛaḷ was presented to the third Śaṅgam, but did not at first win the approval of the members. It is said that the members sat on the plank floating on the tank, along with the *Kuṛaḷ*. It so happened that excepting for the space occupied by the book, the rest went down into the water with the members who had to swim for life. Tradition associates with this legend the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* which is, according to some scholars, a later work. The probable historical data that can be gathered from this is the fact of presenting a work for approval in a royal Academy. These two instances are then enough to demonstrate the antiquity of the institution of an Academy on an organized basis in the early centuries before the Christian era. The *Kuṛaḷ* as we shall see in the sequel is assigned to the second century B.C. and hence the *Tolkāppiyam* which is generally accepted as the earlier composition must be assigned to the third or fourth century before Christ.[1]

Change of venue: a probable historical fact.—A significant circumstance in this connection is that the above legend refers to the change of the Śaṅgam headquarters from Dakṣiṇa Madura to Kavāṭapuram and from the latter to the Uttara Madura or the modern city of Madura. This is a probable historical fact. The change of the capital of the Pāṇḍyan kings is confirmed by other literary references and corroborated by the classical writer Pliny, who refers to the transfer of capital from Koṛkai to Madura.[2] The incident of the sea swallowing a portion of the Pāṇḍyan territory is attested by a reference in the *Śilappadikāram*[3] and in the *Kalittogai*.[4] In his gloss on the *Śilappadikāram*[5]

1 See K. S. Śrinivāsa Pillai, *Tamiḻ Varalāṛu*, p. 8.
2 See Warmington, *Commerce between Roman Empire and India*, p. 167.
3 Canto xi, ll. 17-22.
4 *Mullaikkali*, 104, ll. 1-4.
5 viii, ll. 1-2.

Aḍiyārkkunallār refers to this incident and says that the extent of the territory devoured by the sea was 700 *Kāvadam* or roughly 1,000 miles. An attempt has been made on the basis of geology and natural history to show that a large continent once existed in the Indian Ocean connected with South India which was later on overwhelmed and submerged by a huge deluge.[1] Though there may be some exaggeration in this account, what we are concerned with here, is the mention of the incident of the sea swallowing the territory. Pēr-Āśiriyar in his commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam* calls this lost territory *Panaināḍu*.[2] It is said that the seat of the second Śaṅgam was Kavāṭapuram. That a certain city by name Kavāṭapuram existed is corroborated by the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya. The place Kavāṭa is among those mentioned in South India by Sugrīva to the monkey messengers in search of Sītā *en route* to Laṅkā. The verse runs that 'having reached Kavāṭa suitable for the Pāṇḍyan kings, rich in gold, celestial and adorned with pearls and gems, oh Vānaras, look for Sītā,[3] there.'

This is clear from the excellent gloss of Gōvindarāja.

पाण्ड्यानां पाण्ड्यराजानाम् । युक्तं योग्यम् । कवाटे ; अनेन नगरं लक्ष्यते ।

मुक्तारूपैर्मणिभिः रत्नैः भूषितम् । तदुत्पत्तिदेशत्वादिति भावः ॥

Again the term Pāṇḍya-Kavāṭa is mentioned by the

[1] See V. J. Tamby Pillai's article on 'An Old Tradition Preserved' in the *Tamilian Antiquary*, vol. ii, No. 1.

[2] *Poruḷ*, on *sūtra* 649, p. 593.

[3] *Kiṣkinda*, ch. 41. 19.

ततो हेममयं दिव्यं मुक्तामणिविभूषितम् ।

युक्तं कवाटं पाण्ड्यानां गता द्रक्ष्यथ वानराः ॥

See M. Rāghava Ayyangar's article on 'Vālmīki and South India' in the *Tamilian Antiquary*, No. 7.

Kauṭalīya as a place noted for a variety of pearl thus confirming the statement in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. According to the commentator of the *Arthaśāstra* the reference in the treatise[1] is to the Malayakōṭi hills in the Pāṇḍyan country. If this interpretation is accepted, it is likely that this name was given to these hills to celebrate the honoured name of Kavāṭa, the ancient seat of learning. From these perfectly reliable references it is obvious that in the epoch of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Arthaśāstra*, Kavāṭa flourished as a city of great wealth. These lines of evidence show that the capital of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom was originally South Madura. Later on Kavāṭa became the capital, and then the modern city of Madura. The transfer of capitals to three different places has perhaps given birth to the legend of the three Śaṅgams. Though the origin of the Śaṅgams as an institution is shrouded in deep mystery, still the fact remains that there was something like an organized Academy from ancient times and it continued to exist for several centuries. A definite stage was reached by the beginning of the sixth century when the Tamil language underwent some transformation in regard to style, metre, etc.

Sec. IV. OTHER REFERENCES TO THE THREE ŚAṄGAMS

In an old palm-leaf manuscript discovered in the house of Śiṟṟambala Kavirāyar of Cevvūr, Paṇḍit Swāminātha Ayyar found an important verse which is published in the *Śilappadikāram*.[2] The author of the said verse adopts completely the account of Nakkīrar so far as the first two Śaṅgams are concerned. In his

[1] *Arthaśāstra*, Bk. ii, ch. 11. [2] Third Ed., Intro., pp. 7 and 8.

account of the third Academy, more names are added. Some of them are Tenūrkiḻār, Manalūrāśiriyar, Peruñśēndaṉār, Perumkumarar, Nīlakaṇṭaṉār, Śīttalai-śāttaṉār Uppūri Kuḍi kiḻār, Dāmōdaraṉār, Kapilar, Paraṇar and Kallāḍar. The value of this account consists in its agreement with the oldest extant account and carries the tradition unbroken.

While on this subject we can recall the two beautiful stanzas[1] of Poyyāmoḻippulavar, a poet of the later medieval age, probably of the ninth century A.D. This poet possibly spent a part of his life in the Court of the Pāṇḍyan king. Perhaps to justify his poetical talents, the king asked him to sing two stanzas relating to the Śaṅgam. Apparently the images of the 49 members of the third Śaṅgam were set up and whenever he addressed every one of these images, they nodded their heads in token of approval. Bereft of the legend this testifies to an attempt to revive the institution of the Śaṅgam.

Sec. V. ANOTHER LEGEND

In this connection mention must be made of Parañ-jōtimāmuṉivar's *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam* wherein the fifty-first *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal* distinctly refers to the mythological origin of the Śaṅgam. This chapter is entitled as *Śaṅgappalakai-tanta-paṭalam* and consists of 38 stanzas dealing practically with this. The account which is mythical is briefly as follows: In the days of the Pāṇḍya King Vaṅgyaśēkara at Madura, Lord Brahmā performed a sacrifice at Benares and went to bathe in the Ganges at the concluding ceremony of his sacrifice (*yajña*) with Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī and Gāyatrī. On the

[1] *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam,* st. 64 and 65.
His other contributions are found in the collection of poems that goes by the name of *Taṉippāḍal.*

way Sarasvatī was entranced, as it were, by the melodious sweet voice of a songstress and hence reached the shore of the river a little late. By this time Brahmā had finished his bathing ceremonies. On Sarasvatī questioning the Lord's action in having bathed without her, little recognizing that the fault was her own, Brahmā was much put out with the result that he cursed her to take birth as a human being. But Sarasvatī realized her mistake and implored His pardon on her knees. Then the Lord became merciful and added that out of fifty-three or fifty-one *akṣaras* (letters) of which her whole body was made up—forty-eight *akṣaras* would become forty-eight poets of great renown and fame. The forty-ninth letter 'Ha' would be the Lord Śiva appearing in the disguise of a *vidvān* or poet. These would bring glory and light to ignorant lands and peoples. Thus only she could be redeemed.

The story goes on to say that these forty-eight took their birth in different places, but still soon met together and wandered through the length and breadth of the land defeating the learned of every Court and assembly in arguments and disputations until at last they reached the Pāṇḍyan capital. The Lord Śiva met them here in the disguise of a poet, took them to His Temple and disappeared. They went to the royal assembly and won the love and esteem of the king by sheer display of their profound learning. Thereupon the Pāṇḍya ordered a special building to be constructed on the north-west of the temple as the Śaṅgam Hall. Here the Lord Śiva appeared to them often and once gave a plank (two spans square) (*śaṅgappalakai*) perhaps a magical one, which would give room to the really deserving though it appeared very small outwardly. Thus it is said to have

accommodated all these forty-nine poets among whom Nakkīrar was the President. These poets were the authors of several poems.

To advert to what we have already said, the original of the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam* was the Sanskrit *Hālāsya Māhātmyam* belonging to the category of the *Sthala Purāṇas*. And when the latter was written, the author must have heard something of the Tamil Śaṅgam extant in Madura, and it is just possible that he gave it a mythological colouring which served in those days to captivate the minds of the masses thus giving it an enormous importance in the public eye. Though much credence is given to this account, there is nothing of historical value as such, for writing the history of the Śaṅgam.

Excepting that the account supports the theory of the existence of a great Śaṅgam in Madura,[1] and that, only one, where the best poets of the time were richly rewarded, it is not of much value.

Sec. VI. THE 'MYTH' OF THE THREE ŚAṄGAMS

The question now presents itself whether there were three distinct separate academies different from one another. A critical study of the account in the commentary on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ* may tend to confirm the tradition contained in the legend of the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam* according to which there was only one Academy. The study of the former legend shows no

[1] It would appear from the gloss of Pēr-Āśiriyar on the *Tolkāppiyam* (*seyyuḷiyal sūtra* 179), that there was a special hall where the poets of the day met. It went by the name of *Paṭṭimaṇḍapam* 'தெற்கண்வாயில் திறவாத பட்டிமண்டபத்தார் பொருட்டு நக்கீரர் ஒருவன் வாழவும் ஒருவன் சாவவும் பாடிய மந்திரம் அங்கதப்பாட்டாயின'. What is more remarkable is that the epics, the *Silappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai* refer to the *paṭṭimaṇḍapam* also (*Maṇi.*, canto i, l. 61, *Silap.*, v, l. 102). The commentator of the *Maṇimēkalai* interprets the term as *Vidyāmaṇḍapam*, *Ōlakkamaṇḍapam*.

cleavage between the first and the second Academy or even between the second and the third Academy. That the same king Muḍattirumāṟaṉ saw the fall of the second at Kavāṭapuram and founded the third in modern Madura demonstrates only transfer of capital and consequently transfer of headquarters of the Academy. The evidence for the Śaṅgam as three separate institutions is too meagre to build anything like a theory.

The term *eṉba* which occurs in the commentary of the *Kaḷaviyal* is a significant expression in early Tamil literature meaning what the French phrase *'on dit'* means. In other words the expression points out that the current traditions were universally believed and accepted. The author of the commentary on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ* then shared the popular belief in traditional three Śaṅgams. One explanation can be that three different stages marked out the growth of the Academy, though we have not much proof of this progressive evolution. It is obvious that a new stage in the history of the Śaṅgam begins with the epoch of the Nāyaṉmārs (Śaiva devotees) and Āḻvārs (Vaiṣṇava devotees) and continues to the present day under the kind patronage of the Rāja of Rāmnād. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that there was an Academy from early times which continued its existence unbroken. But when it originated, we are not able to say with any definiteness.

Sec. VII. THE AGE OF THE TAMIL ŚAṄGAM

But what is more difficult is to fix the chronological limits to the different stages of the Academy. If we are to give credence to the legend in the commentary of the *Ahapporuḷ,* the commencement of the Academy must be placed somewhere in 9000 B.C. Though the heyday of

Dravidian culture is carried to the fourth and the fifth millenniums B.C. by recent archæological discoveries in the Mohenjodāro and Hārappa, still it is by no means an easy task to establish a connection between these Dravidians of the Punjab and the Tamils of the South India. Consequently it is difficult to accept a very ancient date for the prevalence of what we now understand as University life. It would be too bold to accept such an early date. From the fact that Gōtama the poet refers in the *Puṛam* to Yudhiṣṭhira (396) and another poet Muḍināgarāya to the Cēra King Udiyaṉ Cēralātaṉ[1] who fed the Pāṇḍava and Kaurava forces in the Great Mahābhārata war it can be assumed that these poets lived in the epoch following the Mahābhārata war. According to the legend contained in the gloss of the *Kaḷaviyal*, these two poets belonged to the first Academy while their poems figure in an anthology ascribed to the third Śaṅgam. This inaccuracy considerably detracts from the value of the legend for historical purposes. But these two poems in the *Puṛam* seem to throw some light on the chronological problem of the Śaṅgam. The references take us to the epoch of the Mahābhārata war. The battle at Kurukṣētra is generally believed to have taken place in the eleventh century B.C. Therefore it is argued that somewhere about the eleventh century B.C.,[2] or a little later the Śaṅgam must have come into being. But against this it may be argued that there was a poetic convention according to which a poet of very much later times might sing of the glories of his patron's far-famed ancestors. If there is any force in this argument the theory of

[1] P. T. Śrinivāsa Ayyangar thinks that it refers to the celebration of the death of the Kauravas by Udiyaṉ by distributing food to people (*History of Tamils*, p. 492).

[2] In Paṇḍit Rāghava Ayyangar's opinion the first Śaṅgam was contemporaneous with the events of the epics.

the tenth or the eleventh century B.C. as the commencement of the epoch of the Śaṅgam goes to the wall. If the author of the *Tirukkuṟaḷ* could be proved to have lived in the second century B.C.[1] then there is warrant for the assumption that the *Tolkāppiyam* is a much earlier work at least one or two centuries earlier than the second century B.C. We have seen already that according to the *Pāyiram* to the *Tolkāppiyam* the latter was presented to the Academy and won its approval. If this account has any significance it compels us to conclude that prior to the days of Tolkāppiyaṉār the Śaṅgam existed as an institution and the Grammarian did what the scholars of his time did. It must be also borne in mind that the grammar of Tolkāppiyaṉār or his illustrious predecessor Agattiyaṉār[2] presupposes a body of literary works. Roughly then a date like the fifth century B.C. may be assigned in regard to the origin of the Śaṅgam.

Sec. VIII. THE DESIGNATION 'ŚAṄGAM'

The expression Śaṅgam is the Tamil form of the Sanskrit word *Saṅgha*. The early poem where there is a reference to this institution is the *Maduraikkāñci*.[3] It is generally believed that the word became popularized by the Jaina and Bauddha Saṅghas which were religious associations and the term came into popular use after the establishment of a Drāviḍa Saṅgha by Vajra

[1] Professor V. Rangācāriar's researches have led him to this conclusion. See *Educa. Review*, October, 1928. According to the Professor the eleventh century B C. is impossible, for the first Śaṅgam presupposes the existence of the Brahmanical civilization in the South and as the advent of the Aryans into the Dekhan took place about 700 B.C., some centuries must have elapsed before an expert body of literary censors was formed. Hence he would assign 300 B.C. when the first Śaṅgam was organized. From this it has a continuous life until A.D. 800.—*Ibid.*

[2] Paṇḍit Swāminātha Ayyar *Saṅgattamiḻum Piṟkālattamiḻum*, pp. 88-9; see T. R. Śeṣa Ayyangar, *Dravidian India*, pp. 81-2.

[3] l. 762 புணர்கூட்டுண்ட புகழ்சால்.

Nandi in A.D. 470—a Jaina organization.[1] The *Maṇimēkalai* refers to a certain Saṅgha as distinct from the Bauddha Saṅgha.[2] In the first instance the term means an assembly of poets.[3]

If it is granted that the Tamil Saṅgha or Śaṅgam is an imitation of the Bauddha Saṅgha, there is the possibility of its being known to the South Indians in the third and the fourth centuries before Christ, since history teaches us the advent of the Buddhists into the South of India and Ceylon during these early centuries. Further it is no alien word to the Sanskrit literature of this time. It was used both in its technical and general sense in the *Dharmaśāstras*, Epics and *Arthaśāstras*. There is no force in the *argumentum silentium*, namely, that the designation does not find mention in the Śaṅgam literature so-called. The Śaṅgam works do not mention the term Śaṅgha but mention terms like tokai, kūḍal, avai, kaḻakam which mean Śaṅgam. In the *Maṇimēkalai* the term Śaṅgam, as we have already seen, is used in the sense of an assembly. Granting again that the term came into use long after the commencement of the Śaṅgam as a literary Academy, still the existence of like institutions,—call it what you will—in centuries before Christ cannot be questioned in the face of a strong tradition which is almost the only source of information of undated history.

Recently an attempt has been made to interpret the term in quite a different light utterly disregarding the voluminous data in the shape of tradition.[4] The suggestion amounts to this: that the term

[1] See *History of the Tamils*, p. 247.
[2] L. XXX, ll. 3-4.
[3] புலம்புரிச் சங்கம் பொருளொடு முழங்க canto vii, 114.
[4] *Journal of Oriental Research*, vol. ii, pt. ii, pp. 149-51.

means a collection, a group, an anthology[1] and that the Sanskrit word 'Saṅgha' was adopted in a curtailed form as a 'Saṅga' or it was a Sanskrit variant for 'Saṅghāta'. This term is translated as *tokainilai*[2] or simply *tokai* in Tamil *Daṇḍi Alaṅkāram.* No doubt the interpretation is ingenious and sets aside the learned views of the great scholars commencing from the commentator of the *Kaḷaviyal* down to the present day. Unfortunately there is not sufficient proof to support it. The verse[3] in the *Kāvyādarśa* means 'there exists that detailed classification of poetry, into Muktaka, Kuḷaka, Kōśa, and Saṅghāta; but it is not mentioned here as it is included within *sarga-bandha* (or composition in cantos).'[4]

In commenting on the term 'Saṅghāta' Taruṇavācaspati says:[5] सङ्घातः एकार्थविषयः एककर्तृकः पद्यसङ्घातः, शरत्सङ्घातद्रमिडसङ्घातादिवत् ॥

This means Saṅghāta is that classification of poetry which deals with only one topic and which is the work of a single author, as per example, the works entitled

[1] In the commentary on the word Saṅgam in verse 714 of the *Takkayāgapparaṇi* two alternative meanings are suggested; either it refers to chank shell or to the collection of poetry, *Iyal, Iśai* and *Nāṭakam.* In a special commentary tacked on at the end of the book the learned editor of the work observes that there were three separate Saṅgams in respect of these three sub-divisions of Tamil poetry. *Iyal* refers to literary Tamil, *Iśai* refers to that division of Tamil literature which consists of verses set to music as distinct from poetry or drama. (See *Tamil Lexicon,* vol. i, part ii, p. 301 and p. 273). *Nāṭakam* refers to dramatic literature. For details of this literature, see V. Swaminātha Ayyar's *Saṅgattamiḻum Piṟkālattamiḻum,* pp. 45-52 (Madras University, 1929). These three constitute what are known as *Muttamiḻ* and have nothing to do with the traditional Saṅgams. See chap. iii of V. G. Sūryanārayaṇa Śāstri, *History of Tamil Language.*

[3] मुक्तकं कुलकं कोशः सङ्घात इति तादृशः ।
सर्गबन्धांशरूपत्वादनुक्तः पद्यविस्तरः ॥ I. 13

[4] Trans. by S. K. Belvalkar, Poona 1924.

[5] P. 10 of the *Kāvyādarśa,* edited by M. Rangācārya, Madras 1910.

Śarat Saṅghāta and *Dramiḍa Saṅghāta.* Let us again see what another commentator Hṛdayaṅgama has to say on this. His gloss runs thus: एकस्मिन्नेव प्रयोजने प्रवृत्ताः नानाविधाः श्लोका भवेयुश्चेत् तथाविधानां समूहः सङ्घातः ।

A number of different *ślokas* which are concerned with a single definite object constitutes a Saṅghāta. From the above explanations it can be gathered that Saṅghāta is but a classification of poetry. The word Saṅghāta may correspond to *Padikam* and *Kalambakam* which are sub-divisions of the Tamil poetry. These *Padikams* and *Kalambakams* are the works of single authors and deal with a single topic. The Śaṅgam poems, on the other hand, deal with a number of topics and are the works of many an author. Besides, *Dramiḍa Saṅghāta,* one of the examples given above, seems to refer to a particular composition rather than to the Tamil anthologies. It would thus be difficult to interpret the term in any other light, and such conjectures would in no way stand the test.

Sec. IX. THE EXTANT ŚAṄGAM WORKS

According to the tradition which finds a mention in the famous commentary on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ* the following are given as the accredited works of the first Śaṅgam: *Paripāḍal, Mudunārai, Mudukuruguu,* and *Kaḷariyāvirai.* The works attributed to the second Śaṅgam are *Kali, Kuruhu, Veṇḍāḷi, Viyāḷamālai Ahaval, Agattiyam, Tolkāppiyam, Māpurāṇam, Iśainuṇukkam,* and *Būdapurāṇam,* the last five being grammatical compositions. The compositions of the third Śaṅgam are *Neḍuntogai* four hundred, *Kuruntogai* four hundred, *Naṟṟiṇai* four hundred, *Puṟam* four hundred, *Aiṅguṟu-nūṟu, Padiṟṟuppattu, Kali* one hundred and fifty, *Paripāḍal* seventy, *Kūttu, Vari, Śiṟṟiśai, Pēriśai,* etc.

It is generally believed that the works of the first Śaṅgam are lost perhaps beyond recovery. The extant *Paripāḍal* may be the composition of the third Śaṅgam rather than that of the first. Since *nārai* and *kuruhu* are suffixed to the titles of works, it is reasonable to conclude that they were musical treatises, and ancient Tamil land developed the arts of music and dancing besides literary activities. From the works of the second Śaṅgam, the synchronism of Agastya and Tolkāppiyaṉār is pointed out. No task is more intricate than to get at the real facts from the legends that have gathered round the sage Agastya.[1] Agastya figures in all the Śaṅgams and this is to be explained by the fact that members of the same family bearing the name Agastya continued to flourish.[2] With regard to the compositions of the second Academy, we have to take it that all of them have been lost. The *Tolkāppiyam* was the grammar during the period of the so-called second and third Academies. Like every ancient writer of repute, legends have gathered round this notable figure, some of them inconsistent and absurd. These legends, whatever their basis be, illustrate the greatness of the writer and the extraordinary influence wielded by him over his contemporaries.[3] The *Tolkāppiyam* is divided into three *adikāras* or books—the *eḻuttadikāram* dealing with phonology, the *śolladikāram* dealing with accidence, syntax, and the *Poruḷadikāram* dealing with Puṟam, Aham, Prosody, etc. The whole contains 1,276 sūtras. Every book

[1] An endeavour in this direction has been made in a recent publication of the Madras University entitled *Agastya in the Tamil Land*, by K. N. Śivarāja Pillai.

[2] Cp. the explanation offered to the repeated mention of Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and others in the Purāṇas by Pargiter in his *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*.

[3] About his religion see S. Vaiyāpuri Pillai's *Critical Essays in Tamil*, pp. 76-83.

is divided in its turn into nine *iyals*. While the *eluttadikāram* and the *śolladikāram* are interesting from both linguistic and philological points of view, the *Poruḷadikāram* is valuable as it gives us a glimpse of the political, social and religious life of the people during the period when Tolkāppiyaṉār lived.[1] The importance of the work is further enhanced by several commentators among whom figure 1. Iḷampūraṇar, 2. Pēr-Āśiriyar, 3. Śēṉāvarayar, 4. Naccinārkkiṉiyar, 5. Daivaccilaiyār, 6. Kallāḍar. In addition to the tradition transmitted in the commentary on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ*, we have other traditions all of which mark the following as the accredited works of the Saṅgam:—the *Eṭṭuttogai*, the *Pattuppāṭṭu* and the *Padiṉeṇ-kīḻkkaṇakku*. To these may be added the *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai*, the two among the five epic poems.[2] The *Eṭṭuttogai* consists of eight collections which are as follows: *Naṟṟiṇai, Kuṟuntogai, Aiṅguṟunūṟu, Padiṟṟuppattu, Paripāḍal, Kalittogai, Neḍuntogai,* and *Puṟanāṉūṟu.*

1. The *Naṟṟiṇai* (edited by P. Nārayaṇaswāmi Ayyar with his own commentary), contains 401 stanzas, each ranging from nine to twelve lines. In it we find the hands of 175 poets. The verses deal with the five

[1] The *Eḻuttadikāram* has been published with commentary of *Iḷampūraṇar* by Vidvān Subbarāya Chettiar and the gloss of *Naccinārkkiṉiyar* is a Śaiva Siddhanta publication.

The *Solladikāram—Iḷampūraṇar* is edited by Paṇḍit C. R. Namaśivāya Mudaliar; *Seṉāvāraiyar* edited by Dāmodaram Pillai; *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* edited by Dāmodaram Piḷḷai. *Daivaccilaiyār* Tanjore Karandai Saṅgam edition.

Poruḷadikāram has been edited by Diwan Bahadur S. Bavānandam Pillai with commentaries.

A notable contribution on the *Poruḷadikāram* is by Paṇḍit M. Rāghava Ayyangar of the Tamil Lexicon Office. Compare also *Sen Tamiḻ*, vol. 16, p. 202 ff.; vol. 18, p. 381 and f.; vol. 19, p. 113 f. and p. 219 ff. To these may be added the scholarly work entitled ' தொல்காப்பியச் சொல்லதிகாரக் குறிப்பு by Dr. P. S. Subrahmania Śāstri, M.A.

[2] The other epic poems are *Cintāmaṇi, Vaḷayāpati* and *Kuṇḍalakēśi*.

tiṇais,[1] 28 on *mullai,* 32 on *marudam,* 107 on *pālai,* 103 on *neydal* and 120 on *Kuriñji.* Its general theme is love and its compilation was at the instance of a Pāṇḍyan king, Pannāḍutanda Pāṇḍiyan Māṟan Vaḻudi.[2] We do not have at present any ancient commentary for this work. A significant fact about this anthology and some others is the Perundēvaṉār's panegyric verse on God in the introduction. Perundēvaṉār, it is well known, is the translator of the *Mahābhārata* and probably flourished in the eighth century after Christ.

2. The *Kuṟuntogai*[3] literally means a collection of short-poems. In this work is brought together a number of verses attributed to as many as 205 poets. This collection contains 402 verses in the *Ahaval* metre, each verse ranging from four to eight lines. As in the *Naṟṟiṇai* the theme of the work is love and the verses can be brought under the category of the five *tiṇais.* It would appear that the compilation of the extant work was effected under the patronage of the chieftain of Pūri (identified with North Malabar) by name Pūrikkō.

There was an ancient gloss on the work by the well-known commentator Pēr-Āśiriyar which has since become lost. From the fact that Naccinārkkiṉiyar chose to write a gloss on twenty verses, and from the circumstances under which he wrote on these select verses, it is obvious that in his age Pēr-Āśiriyar's commentary existed except for the twenty stanzas commented upon by Naccinārkkiṉiyar.[4]

[1] These five *tiṇais* are regions of hills, of river valleys, desert, of sea-coast and of forests. The evolution of literary conventions denotes the passage of man from one culture to another. For an able study on the subject, see *History of the Tamils,* p. 63 ff.

[2] பன்னாடு தந்த பாண்டியன் மாறன் வழுதி.

[3] See also *Sen Tamil,* vol. xiv, p. 185 f. and p. 338 ff.

[4] Edited by Paṇḍit Rangaswāmi Ayyangar of Vāniyambāḍi with a commentary of his own.

3. The *Aiṅguṟunūṟu* means literally the short five hundred. It contains 500 *Ahaval* verses and the whole book can be conveniently divided into five parts, each part consisting of 100 verses. Each verse contains three to six lines. Every part again deals with the five *tiṇais.* The first hundred verses are on *marudam* attributed to the poet Ōrambōgiyār. Ammūvaṉār is the author of the second hundred verses dealing with *neydal.* The authorship of the third part of the hundred verses on *kuṟiñji* is attributed to the poet Kapilar, and the fourth part on *pālai* to Ōdalāndaiyār. The fifth and last part containing the last hundred verses of the work is by the poet Pēyaṉār and deals with *mullaittiṇai.* In most cases we have no knowledge of the redactions or editors who compiled these scattered works. In the case of this work however the name of the compiler is known as Kūḍalūr Kiḻār. The full name of this editor is given as Pulatturai Muṟṟiya Kūḍalūr Kiḻār.[1] It is said that Kūḍalūr Kiḻār compiled this *Aiṅguṟunūṟu* at the instance of the king Cēramāṉ Irumpoṟai, whose full name is Yāṉai-k-kaṭśēy-māndaran-Cēral-Irumpoṟai. No commentary on this work is available at present. We do not know whether there was any ancient commentary on this.

4. The *Padiṟṟuppattu* (the Ten Tens) is an anthology of enormous importance. Here we are introduced to a number of kings of the Cēra dynasty, with a splendid record of their deeds and achievements thus enabling us to get at a true picture of the political conditions of Tamil land about two thousand years ago. Of the ten books into which the whole work is divided, the first and the last are not available to us. Each of the

[1] புலத்துறை முற்றிய கூடலூர் கிழார்.

remaining eight books consists of one hundred stanzas. The following names of kings among others occur in this collection. They are Imayavaramban̲ Neḍuñcēralātan̲, Palyān̲aiccelkeḻu Kuṭṭuvan̲ his brother, Kaḷaṅkaikkaṇṇi-nārmuḍiccēral, Śeṅguṭṭuvan̲, Kuṭṭuvañcēral his son, Āḍukōṭpāṭṭuccēralātan̲, Śelvakkaḍuṅgōvāḻiyātan̲, Tagaḍūr-eṟinda-Perum Cēral Irumpoṟai, and Kuḍakkō-Iḷañcēral Irumpoṟai. Some more details about this monarch are also found. In the Second Ten we find Imayavaramban̲ reigning fifty-eight years and in the Third Ten his younger brother Palyān̲ai Kuṭṭuvan ruling for twenty years, who helped Pālai Gōtaman̲ār in his performance of a great *yajña*. According to the Fourth Ten Nārmuḍiccēral ruled for twenty years. The Fifth Ten mentions the reign of Śeṅguṭṭuvan̲ as fifty years and the Sixth Ten of Cēralātan̲ as thirty-eight years. The Seventh Ten mentions Śelvakkaḍuṅgō's tenure of rule as twenty years. Irumpoṟai ruled for seventeen years according to the Eighth Ten, and Kuḍakkō for sixteen years according to the Ninth Ten. Thus a close study of the *Padiṟṟuppattu* is invaluable to a student of Cēra history. Neither the compiler nor the patron of the work is known to us.[1]

5. The *Paripāḍal*[2] (literally stanzas of strophic metre) is according to tradition a composition of the first Academy as well as the third Academy. If both are different works, the first Śaṅgam work is lost. The *Paripāḍal* of the third Academy is said to consist of seventy stanzas attributed as usual to multifarious poets. It is unfortunate that as many as forty-six verses of this important work are lost. The only available portion of the *Paripāḍal* consists of twenty-four stanzas.

[1] There exists an old gloss on it which has been printed in his edition of the text by Paṇḍit Swāminātha Aiyar.

[2] See *Tolk. Śeyyuḷ sūtra*, 120-2.

There is an ancient commentary of Parimēlalagar which has been printed with the available texts by Mahāmahōpādhyāya V. Swāminātha Aiyar.

6. The *Kalittogai,* otherwise known as *Kurunkalittogai* or simply *Kali*[1] is yet another important work of this category. It contains one hundred and fifty stanzas in the *kali* metre dealing with the five *tiṇais*. Its theme is love but it also contains a number of moral maxims. Incidentally it furnishes us with some peculiar marriage customs current in those ancient days. Kaḍuṅgōn, Kapilar, Marudan Iḷanāganār, Cōla Nalluttiran and Nallanduvanār are the poets who composed the various songs in the work. We have no *prima facie* evidence as to the name of the compiler and the patron at whose instance the work was compiled. But it is generally believed that one of the five poets Nallanduvanār was the compiler. The celebrated commentator Naccinārkkiniyar has written a gloss on it.

7. The *Neḍuntogai,* otherwise known as *ahappāṭṭu* and popularly known as *ahanānūru* or simply *aham* is an anthology of sufficient importance and value to a student of ancient Tamil culture. It contains 401 stanzas in the *Ahaval* metre and is divided into three sections,—*Kaḷirriyānai-nirai*[2] of 121 verses, *Maṇimiḍaipavaḷam*[3] of 180 verses and *Nittilakkōvai*[4] of 100 verses. Its general theme is love. The length of the verses varies from thirteen to thirty-seven lines. As many as 145 names of poets are given in this collection whose compiler was Uruttiraśarman, the son of Uppūrikuḍi

[1] Edited by Dāmōdaram Piḷḷai; see also *Sen Tamiḻ,* vol. xv, pp. 1-17 and 115-6.

[2] .

[3] மணிமிடைபவளம்

[4] ,

Kiḻār of Madura. It was accomplished under the distinguished auspices of the Pāṇḍyan king Ukkirapperuvaḻudi.[1]

8. The *Puṟanāṉūṟu* otherwise known as *Puṟappāṭṭu* or simply *Puṟam* is a valuable anthology of 400 stanzas in *Ahaval* form.[2] It is the counterpart of the preceding work the *Ahanāṉūṟu,* and deals with aspects of ancient Tamil culture and forms a good record of the Tamil civilization in ancient times. There is a view that the work is a later compilation inasmuch as the name of Poygaiyār, a poet of Post-Śaṅgam days is mentioned among the poets referred to in the *Puṟam*. It also contains the poems of Murañjiyūr Muḍināgarāyar, Vāṉmīkiyār and others who, according to the legends, belong to the first Acadēmy. Thus the anthology contains odes ranging from the epoch of the so-called First Śaṅgam to that of Post-Śaṅgam. Whatever may be the date of its compilation, the events it treats of are ancient and hence invaluable to an antiquarian.

Sec. X. THE PATTUPPĀṬṬU

The *Pattuppāṭṭu* is a collection of ten poems, the composition of which is assigned to the epoch of the third Śaṅgam. Against this may be advanced that it does not find mention in the list of works given in the gloss on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ* dealing with the traditional age of the Śaṅgam. How this argument is only a frail reed to lean upon can be proved by other reliable testimony. The chief and unassailable points which lend strong support to the view that they are also to be styled among the Śaṅgam works can be categorically stated. There is, first, the fact that the poets who are the authors of these verses are all Śaṅgam poets,

[1] Edited by V. Rājagōpāla Ayyangar with introduction by Paṇḍit R. Raghava Ayyangar.

[2] Edited by Paṇḍit Swāminātha Ayyar.

the celebrated names found in the *Eṭṭuttogai* collection including Māṅguḍi Marudaṉār, Nakkīrar, Kapilar, etc.

Secondly, the kings celebrated in these poems like Karikāṟcōḻaṉ, Toṇḍaimāṉ Iḷandiṟaiyaṉ, Pāṇḍiyaṉ Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ are kings who were patrons of the Śaṅgam poets as testified to by accounts in other works of the Śaṅgam.

Thirdly, the theme of the poems is predominantly of the nature of *aham* and subordinately of the nature of *puṟam,* the subjects largely relating to the five *tiṇais* or the literary conventions according to the explanation furnished by the great grammarian Tolkāppiyaṉār.

Fourthly, there is the literary style of the poems themselves. The language, the classical style, and the metre peculiar to that style are all in evidence to point out the authenticity of these poems as belonging to the category of the traditional Śaṅgam.

It is then obvious that the *Pattuppāṭṭu* is to be included in the Śaṅgam works proper.[1] The ten poems of which the work consists are the *Tirumuruhāṟṟuppaḍai,* the *Porunar-āṟṟuppaḍai,* the *Śirupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai,* the *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai,* the *Mullaippāṭṭu,* the *Maduraikkāñci,* the *Neḍunalvāḍai,* the *Kuriñjippāṭṭu,* the *Paṭṭinappālai,* and the *Malaipaḍukaḍām.* We shall briefly examine each of these poems.

1. The *Tirumuruhāṟṟuppaḍai* is a poem of 317 lines and is the composition of poet Nakkīrar. It is a poem on the different manifestations of God Muruha or the War-God as presented in the different shrines of Tamil India. The shrines referred to in the poem are Tirupparaṅkuṉṟam, Tiruccīralaivāy (Tiruccendur), Tiruvāviṉaṉkuḍi (Paḻni), Tiruvēragam (Swāmimalai) and Paḻamudirśōlai. One characteristic feature of the

[1] See the article on 'The Age of Pattuppāṭṭu', by T. A. Rāmalinga Chettiar in the *Tamilian Antiquary,* No. 9, pp. 49-72.

whole is that these are all hill shrines. There is a legend that has gathered round the origin of the composition of this poem. A short notice of this will be made later on in the life sketch of the poet Nakkīrar. Suffice it to say here that it illustrates that Nakkīrar was an ardent devotee of the Subrahmaṇya cult. The poem has assumed a sacred character about it and is got by rote by every follower of the War-God. The value of the poem lies in its depicting the social life of the people in ancient Tamil Nāḍu. Naccinārkkiniyar has written a valuable commentary on it.

2. *Porunar-āṟṟuppaḍai* is an important composition of this category. Its value lies in affording rich materials to a student of the political history of ancient Tamil India. It is a poem sung by the poet Muḍattāmakkaṇṇiyār. The king celebrated by the poet is no other than the famous Karikāṟcōlan, the son of Ilañjēṭśenni. Here we are introduced to the life of the king Karikāla under the respective heads of his birth, heroic deeds and administrative capacity. Incidentally the poet gives a description of the then Cōla kingdom, its richness and fertility due to the unfailing waters of the Kāviri, its agricultural and economic prosperity, the result of true statesmanship on the part of the ruling sovereign. Though it is natural for a poet who expects munificence from a patron like the ruler of the land to exaggerate his character and genius as well as the conditions of the kingdom under his sway, still the work under notice is a valuable contribution and can in one sense be regarded as an historical composition. The poem consists of 248 lines in all.

3. The *Śiṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* is as valuable as the preceding work the *Porunar-āṟṟuppaḍai*. The authorship of this composition is attributed to one Iḍaikalināṭṭu-

nallūr Nattattaṉār. The king celebrated by the poet is Nalliyakkōḍaṉ of Ōymā nāḍu, a chieftain of the Ōviyar clan. In narrating the exploits of this chief, the poet makes mention of several chieftains who were liberal in gifts. These chiefs are Pēhaṉ, Pāri, Kāri, Āy, Adigamāṉ, Naḷḷi and Ōri. In addition, light is also thrown on the three capital cities of the triumvirs the Pāṇḍya, Cēra and Cōḻa. There is a special reference to the Cēran king Kuṭṭuvaṉ planting the emblem of the bow on the lofty Himalayas (ll. 47-50). Other cities mentioned by the poem are Vēlūr, Āmūr and Eyil. Thus we have here an elaborate description of the political conditions of South India, invaluable to a student of history. This poem contains 269 lines.

4. The *Perumpāṇārṟuppaḍai* is not inferior in importance and value to a student of political history of ancient South India. Its author is Kaḍiyalūr Uruttiraṉ Kaṇṇaṉār who is also the author of the *Paṭṭiṉappālai* which we shall examine presently. The *Porunar-āṟṟuppaḍai* describes the Cōḻa kingdom and its ruler whereas the *Perumpāṇārṟuppaḍai* describes the kingdom of Kāñci and its ruler. The king celebrated is Toṇḍaimāṉ Iḷandiraiyaṉ. Some aspects of his administration are given in an elaborate manner as well as the origin of Kāñci, and its description, the conditions of trade and commerce. It contains sufficient materials for writing an historical geography of South India. The poem contains 500 lines.

5. The *Mullaippāṭṭu*, the composition of which is attributed to Nappūdaṉār of Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam contains 103 lines and is supposed to have been sung in honour of Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ of Talaiyālaṅgāṉam. Its general theme is love and it gives a vivid description of the feelings of a lady separated from her lover who had

gone to the battle. Incidentally we are introduced to factors determining the battlefield, encampment, etc.

6. The poem *Maduraikkāñci* is a long poem in those constituting *Pattuppāṭṭu*. Māṅguḍi Marudaṉār is the author of this celebrated work. We have just seen two poems, one dealing with the Cōḻa kingdom and the other with Kāñci. In this poem there is a description of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom. The king celebrated by the poem is the Pāṇḍyan Talaiyālaṅgāṉattu-c-ceruveṉṟa Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ. From this it may be inferred that the author of this poem was a contemporary of the author of the *Mullaippāṭṭu*, Nappūdaṉār, who refers to the same monarch. In this poem there is a detailed description of the Pāṇḍyan capital, the army, trade centres, seaports, festivals, and administrative institutions, thus enriching the materials for the cultural history of Tamil Nāḍu. It contains 782 lines.

7. The *Neḍunalvāḍai* is a poem attributed to the famous poet Nakkīrar. The king celebrated is again Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ of Talaiyālaṅgāṉam fame, thus pointing out the contemporaneity of Māṅguḍi Marudaṉār with Nakkīrar. The theme of the poem is more or less the same as that of the *Mullaippāṭṭu*. In other words it is an expression of the feelings of the lady love for the king absent in the field of battle and of consolation by her maid who testifies to the great valour of the lord and his victorious return. Incidentally it refers to some aspects of warfare in Tamil India. There is an excellent description of the winter season in seventy lines. The whole poem contains 188 lines.

8. The *Kuṟiñjippāṭṭu* is yet another composition of this category bringing out the social conditions of the Tamil land in prominent relief. It is the work of Kapilar, a contemporary of Nakkīrar as we shall see in

the sequel. There is a legend grown round the origin of the composition of this poem, viz., to introduce a northern king Pirahattan̲ to the beauties of Tamil litera-true. In this poem Kapilar[1] essays to depict love and village life with its natural and mountain sceneries. The theme of the poem is simple. A fair maiden with a maid was sent to watch the millet field. Once a mountain chief in the course of his chase happen-ed to come there. He fell in love with the lovely girl and married her according to the *Gāndharva* system. From that day, they met daily but the knowledge of their wedlock was not brought to the notice of her parents. Seeing her get emaciated, her mother was told by the maid of what had taken place so as to bring about the indissoluble embrace of the girl with her lord. The poem consists of 261 lines.

9. *Paṭṭin̲appālai* is yet another composition of much value. Its author is Uruttiran̲ Kan̲n̲an̲ār as was stated above. The king celebrated by this poem is Karikāṟ-cōḻan̲. It is said that he was so much moved by the high literary merits of the composition that he awarded sixteen lakhs of *pon̲s* to its author. It testifies to the growing prosperity of Kāvirippaṭṭin̲am under the bene-volent rule of Karikāla. The real value of the poem consists in giving us an idea of the trade relations of Tamil land with foreign countries, its busy mart and some administrative details of importance. It is a poem of 301 lines.

10. The *Malaipaḍukaḍām*, otherwise known as *Kūttarāṟṟuppaḍai* is attributed to poet Peruṅ-Kauśikan̲ār of Peruṅkun̲ṟūr. The poem which is in 583 lines cele-brates the achievements of the chieftain Nan̲n̲an̲, as well as his ancestors and his Court. There is reference to the

[1] See *infra* a study of Kapilar.

Śiva shrine in the Naviram hill in the kingdom of Nannan, and also to the agricultural products, mountains, and gardens found therein.

Sec. XI. THE EIGHTEEN MINOR WORKS

The next collection of the Śaṅgam works comes under the general heading—the *Padinen-kīḻk-kaṇakku,* the eighteen poems dealing primarily with morals (Tamil *aṟam,* Sans. *dharma*).[1]

The term *kīḻk-kaṇakku* implies that there was a classification like *mēṟ-kaṇakku.* The works that contain less than fifty stanzas, composed in different metres, generally come under the *kīḻk-kaṇakku.* But if the *veṇbā* metre is pressed into service, the poem can be of any length and can still find a place in *kīḻk-kaṇakku.* The *mēṟ-kaṇakku* ranges from 50 to 500 stanzas and is in the *ahaval, kalippā,* and *paripāḍal* metre. The *Eṭṭut-tohai* and the *Pattuppāṭṭu* come under the category of *mēṟ-kaṇakku.* Two works like the *Nālaḍiyār* and the *Tirukkuṟaḷ* which come under the category of *kīḻk-kaṇakku* deal with the three *puruṣārthas* or objects of life, dharma (*aṟam*), artha (*poruḷ*) and kāma (*inbam*). The remaining sixteen deal both with *aham* and *puṟam,* the object aimed at being practice of *dharma* or morals. One may question whether these eighteen poems may legitimately claim a right place in the realm of the classical works (Śaṅgam). Apart from the fact that traditional lore associates these works with the third Academy, some of the tests which we applied in the case of *Pattuppāṭṭu* hold good here. For instance, the authors of these productions and the chiefs celebrated therein, in addition to the nature of the themes discussed,

[1] அடிநிமிர் பில்லாச் செய்யுட் டொகுதி
யறம்பொரு ளின்ப மடுக்கி யவ்வத்
திறம்பட வுரைப்பது கீழ்க்கணக் காகும். (*Panniruppāṭṭiyal*)

occur also in most of the poems of this list, thus corroborating the traditional view now generally accepted. These poems which are of different lengths are the following: the *Tirukkuṟaḷ*, the *Nāladiyār*, the *Kaḷavaḻi-nārpadu*, the *Kainilai*, the *Iṉiyavai-nārpadu*, the *Iṉṉā-nārpadu*, the *Nāṉmaṇikkaḍikai*, the *Kārnārpadu*, the *Aintiṇai-aimbadu*, *the Tiṇaimoḻi-aimbadu*, the *Aintiṇai-eḻupadu*, the *Tiṇaimoḻi-nūṟraimbadu*, the *Tirikaḍukam*, the *Ēlādi*, the *Ācārak-kōvai*, the *Paḻamoḻi-nāṉūṟu*, the *Śiṟupañcamūlam*, the *Mudumoḻikkāñci*. We shall notice in brief each one of the above eighteen poems.[1]

1. The *Tirukkuṟaḷ* (popularly known as the *muppāl*) is the famous work of the celebrated Tiruvaḷḷuvar who, according to one version, lived in the early centuries before Christian era and according to the other as late as the sixth or seventh century A.D. The poem is in the form of couplets and deals with the three aims of human life—*dharma*, *artha and kāma*. It consists of 133 chapters, each containing one hundred *kuṟaḷ-veṇbās*, or couplets. Each couplet is a gem by itself and conveys lofty thoughts couched in terse language. Though the scholarly commentary of the illustrious Parimēlaḻagar—a happy consummation of Tamil and Sanskrit culture—is largely in use, there were nine equally well-known commentaries of which Maṇakkuḍavar's gloss which is available is one.[2]

2. The *Nāladiyār*[3] comes nearer the *Kuṟaḷ* in point of subject-matter including the division of the subjects. It also deals with the three pursuits of human life. It contains forty chapters, each consisting of ten stanzas. This

[1] I have slightly altered the generally-accepted order of these poems. See G. S. Duraisamy, *Tamil Literature*, pp. 163-77.

[2] There are a number of editions of this treatise, some with commentaries and some with mere texts. The edition followed here is the eleventh edition by Āṟumuga Nāvalar. For a detailed study on the subject, see below the chapter on *Tirukkuṟaḷ*.

[3] Edited by V. Rājagōpāla Ayyangar, Madras.

anthology, the composition of which can be attributed to different hands, owes its compilation to one Padumaṉār. It has been contended that, as it refers to the *Muttarai-yars* (11.200 and 296), the lower chronological limit should be the eighth century.[1] This question which is discussed by the editor in his preface points to a number of data which afford proof as to the antiquity of the poem.[2] In the opinion of the learned editor, this work must be contemporaneous with the *Maṇimēkalai* and not later than that. Anyhow it cannot be earlier than the *Kuṟaḷ*.

3. The *Kaḷavaḻi-Nārpadu* (literally forty stanzas dealing with the means and methods of war) is a war-poem the authorship of which is attributed to Poyhaiyār. From a sūtra 'கூதிர்வேனில்''in the *Puṟattiṇai* of the *Tol-kāppiyam,* we find that Kaḷavaḻi is of two kinds,[3] one referring to agriculture and the other to war. Hence Kaḷam means a threshing floor or a battle-field. The king celebrated in this poem[4] is Cēraṉ Kaṇaikkāl Irumpoṛai who had been defeated by the Cōḷa king Śeṅgaṇāṉ at the battle of Kaḻumalam and cast into prison at Kuḍavāyil. The use of elephant corps is prominently mentioned. It has been sought to identify the author of this work with Poyhai Āḻvār. But the Cēra and the Cōḷa kings referred to in the poem are not contemporaries of the celebrated Āḻvār and belong to more ancient times as is evident from the colophon at the end of the *Puṟam*, 74. The value of the work consists in giving us details on the art of war as was then understood. There are two commentaries to this—one

[1] See *Sen Tamiḻ,* vol. x, 4.

[2] See p. 11 ff.

[3] 'ஏரோர் களவழி யன்றிக் களவழித்
தேரோர் தோற்றிய வென்றியும்,' Sūtra 76.

[4] See the edition of this poem by Paṇdit Vēṅkaṭaswāmi Nāṭṭār (South Ind. Saiva Siddhānta Works Society, Tinnevelly 1924).

ancient and the other modern.

4. *Kainilai*[1] and not *Innilai* is another poem of *Padinen-kīlkkaṇākku*. The work is in M.S. and is not yet published.

5. The *Iniyavai-nārpadu* (also *Iniyatu-nārpadu*) is a poem consisting of forty stanzas in *venbā* metre. Pūdañ Śēndanār is said to be the author of this extant work. Each of the forty verses treats of three or four objects to be achieved in the world. *Iniyavai* literally means 'pleasant things.' According to the poem there are 126 such things in the world which deserve to be wished for by every person. It is a poem on *aram* dealing with *nīti* or maxims.[2]

6. The *Innā-nārpadu* is a poem of greater interest, and as was already stated its author was Kapilar. It is also a poem of forty stanzas in the *venbā* metre. *Innā* literally means 'not pleasant." Each verse treats of four evil things and on the whole we have a catalogue of 164 such things which ought to be avoided by every right-thinking person. This work also comes under the category of poems dealing with *nīti* or maxims. The practical application of what ought to be done and what ought not to be done dealt with in these two small poems will lead to the progress of mankind.[3]

7. The *Nānmaṇikkadikai*[4] is the work of one Viḷambināganār. The available materials do not afford any proof as to his native home, his caste or the date of his birth. Internal evidence of the poem shows that he was a Vaiṣṇavite by religion. It contains 104 stan-

[1] See *Āḻvār Kālanilai*, pp. 29-30.

[2] Edited by R. Rāghava Ayyangar with commentary, Second Edition (Madura), 1920.

[3] Edited by Paṇḍit Vēnkaṭaswāmi Nāṭṭār with commentary, Śaiva Siddhānta Works (1925).

[4] Edited by V. Rājagōpāla Ayyangar with the old commentary, Madras (1924).

zas in *veṇbā* metre, each *veṇbā* dealing with four things which one ought to do or ought not to do. The author speaks highly of the value of education and educational discipline (st. 70 and 94). There is an ancient commentary to this work, but the authorship of this celebrated commentary is highly doubted.

8. The *Kārnāṟpaḍu*[1]:—The author of this poem is Maduraikkaṇṇaṉ Kūttaṉār. It consists of forty stanzas in *veṇbā* metre. The theme of the poem is *aham* or love. The poem describes the desperate feelings of a lady love who has been separated from her lover by force of circumstances, and who eagerly awaits his return in the rainy season (*kār*-Tamil, *varṣākāla* Sanskrit). The poem reminds us of the Sanskrit work *Mēghasandēśa* of the immortal Kālidāsa. Apart from the fine sentiments relating to love affairs, the description of nature and natural scenery is vivid. What is of more significance is the reference to the *yajña-agni* of Vēdic followers (verse 7).

9. The *Aintiṇai-aimpadu* is yet another love poem whose authorship is attributed to Māṟaṉ-Poṟaiyaṉār. Unfortunately no details are available either with regard to the author or to the compiler. It contains fifty stanzas in *veṇbā* metre. We find five *tiṇais* or literary conventions mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam*, described by way of illustration, in the works of *mēṟ-kaṇakku*. The five *tiṇais* of love as depicted in this poem are the feelings of company, meeting, embrace, separation and desire for reunion.

10. The *Tiṇaimoḻiyaimpadu*[2] is the work of Kaṇṇaṉ Śēndaṉār, son of Śāttandaiyār. No more detail is

[1] Edited by Paṇḍit Vēnkaṭaswāmi Naṭṭār with commentary (Śaiva Siddhānta Works, 1925).

[2] Edited by Paṇḍit Tirunāvukkaraśu Mudaliar and published by the S. I. Saiva Siddhānta Works Society, Tinnevelly.

known about this author. But from literary style and the method of the treatment of the subject, there is no denying the fact that the author must have flourished in the beginnings of the Christian era. It contains fifty stanzas and deals with the five *tiṇais* of love poetry like the *Aintiṇai-aimpadu,* ten stanzas being devoted to each of the *tiṇais*: *Kuṟiñji, Pālai, Mullai, Marudam* and *Neydal.* There is an ancient commentary to this poem, but the author is not traceable.

11. The *Aintiṇai-eḻupadu* is a poem exactly in line with the above two works which come under the sub-division of *Tiṇaic-ceyyuḷ* or *ain-tiṇaic-ceyyuḷ.* The author of this poem is one Mūvādiyār about whom no reliable data are available. It is a poem of seventy verses and deals with *aham* or love conventions. The same five *tiṇais* are mentioned in connection with this subject, each *tiṇai* consisting of fourteen verses. The poems of this class throw light incidentally on some of the customs and habits of the people of those days.

12. The *Tiṇaimālai-nūṟṟaimpadu* is still another poem treating of *ahapporuḷ* corresponding to the above three works. The author of this poem is said to be Kaṇimēdāviyār. As the title of the poem indicates, this poem consists of 150 stanzas divided into five *tiṇais* relating to the subject of love. Thirty stanzas are devoted to each of these five *tiṇais* in the accepted order of *Kuṟiñji, Pālai, Mullai, Marudam* and *Neydal.* There is not enough material with regard to the life of the author. He seems to have been also an ancient poet.

13. The *Tirikaḍugam** literally 'three drugs' is a poem containing one hundred and one verses including the first prefatory stanza addressed to Tirumāl. The

author of this work is Nallādaṉār. Each *veṇbā* refers to three things which are compared to the three indigenous drugs.[1] As these medicinal articles would effect speedy cure of physical ill, things referred to in the *veṇbās* would be a cure for mental ills and will lead to a mind at ease. There is a commentary to this poem, whose authorship is attributed to one Rāmānujācāriyar of Tirukkōṭṭiyūr.

14. The *Ēlādi* is a poem in line with the above work *Tirikaḍugam.* While in the latter every *veṇbā* mentions three wholesome things, in the former a compound of six medicines is given.[2] These six medicinal articles are compared to six worldly truths pertaining to the life of householders and ascetics. The author of this poem which consists of eighty-two verses in *veṇbā* metre including the prefatory stanza of prayer is Kaṇimēdāviyār. It is believed that this poet was a Jaina by conviction from the introductory verse. But this admits of different interpretations. The positive reference to the four Vēdas shows that the author's religion was orthodox Hinduism. It may be remembered that he was also the author of *Tiṇaimālainūṟṟaimpadu* of which we have already spoken.[3]

15. The *Ācārak-kōvai* is the work of Muḷḷiyār of Peruvāyil and reminds us of the *ācāra-kāṇḍa* of the Dharmasūtras and the Dharmaśāstras. It is a treatise on the rules of conduct to be observed by members of the Hindu household. It is apparently a collection of verses which have been promulgated by seers and sages of old. The theme is so identical with the Sanskrit religious

[1] Dry ginger (சுக்கு), pepper (மிளகு), and piper longum (திப்பலி).

[2] ஏலம், இலவங்கம், சிறுநாவற்பூ, மிளகு, திப்பலி, சுக்கு.

[3] Edited by Paṇḍit Gōvindarāja Mudaliar with the available gloss of Vidvān Rājagōpāla Pillai, Madras (1924).

works that one is tempted to regard it as a later work and perhaps a composition of the last period of the third Academy. It contains one hundred and one stanzas including the prefatory verse attributed to God Śiva. Apparently the author was a Śaivite by religion.

16. The *Paḻamoḻi-nāṉūṟu*[1] is the work of Muṉṟuṟai-yaraiyar, apparently a Jaina by conviction. The work contains four hundred stanzas in *veṇbā* metre, each embodying a proverb in the end. Some of the proverbs convey lofty ideas and are popular even to-day. The chief merit of the poem lies in its references to old stories, thus affording rich food for the antiquarian.

17. The *Śiṟupañcamūlam* or the little five medicinal articles[2] is a poem in 98 stanzas in *veṇbā* metre. As the *pañcamūlam* or the compound of five drugs would go a long way to cure a man's ills, so also the maxims contained in each of these *veṇbās* would, by proper application, relieve one of the cycle of birth and death. Each *veṇbā* contains five things. The author of this poem is one Kāriyāśāṉ. The style and theme of the poem warrant us to confirm it to be an early work. From the second stanza it is seen that the work aims at *svadharma*,[3] *ahimsā* or non-injury to living beings, truthfulness, refraining from meat eating, and also from theft.

18. The *Mudumoḻikkāñci*[4] is the work of Madurai Kūḍalūr Kiḻār and contains ten chapters each consisting

[1] Edited by T. Śelvakēśavarāya Mudaliar, Madras. See also *Sen Tamil*, vol. xv, where Paṇḍit Tirunārāyaṇa Ayyangar has edited a portion of it with an old commentary.

[2] Edited with the commentary by Paṇḍit Āṟumugam Servai, Madras, 1923.

[3] தந்தவொழுக்கம்.

[4] Edited by T. Śelvakēśavarāya Mudaliar, Madras, 1919.

of ten *nīti* maxims in sūtra style. The term *Mudumoḻikkāñci* is interesting. Kāñci is one of the seven *Puṟattiṇais* and *Mudumoḻikkāñci* is one of the *Kāñcittiṇai*. The nature of this *tiṇai* is to find a stable basis for the unstable things of the world.[1]

The poem relates to different aspects of *aṟam* and *poruḷ*. *Iṉbam* is not included in that category. The author of the work, Kūḍalūr Kiḻār, is a well-known poet in the collections under the category of *mēṟkaṇakku*. He is the author of some poems in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and the *Kuṟuntogai*. He was apparently a native of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam though according to one version he is said to have belonged to Madura.

In the above brief survey of the eighteen poems traditionally assigned to the epoch of the third Śaṅgam I have tried to utilize as far as possible the available editions and their learned introductions. A mere glance at these editions will convince every one that there is need for getting them well edited and their materials, some of them being very old, well exploited. It is now for an earnest student of Tamil culture to tackle this source of information. From what we know, none of them excepting the *Kuṟaḷ* and the *Nālaḍiyār* has occupied the critic's attention in such a degree as it should. It seems desirable and even imperative that a chronological study of these works should immediately be undertaken so as to utilize the materials for an authoritative study of the evolution of the Tamil people and the progress of their culture in a certain period of their history.

1 கழிந்தோர் ஏனை ஒழிந்தோர்க்குக் காட்டிய
முறைமை யாகும் முதுமொழிக் காஞ்சி (*Divākaram*).

CHAPTER II

SOME ŚAṄGAM POETS—A STUDY

Sec. I. NAKKĪRAR

The Name.—If there is any force in the theory that tradition as transmitted in literature is a fairly reliable source of information for the undated period of India's history, it is but reasonable to assume that the Śaṅgam existed as an institution well patronized by kings and poets. Among the notable celebrities who constituted the so-called third great Academy at Madura, Nakkīrar was pre-eminent.[1] That he was a contemporary of Kapilar and Paraṇar, is testified to by the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal Purāṇam* of Nambi,[2] though a late work. He is known in literature by different names, such as, Kīrar, Nakkīrar, and Naṛkkīrar. The word *gīr* in Sanskrit means speech or Goddess of Learning and it may be that he was so highly learned in his time that people called him Kīran. Nakkīrar is the great Kīrar and Naṛkkīrar is the good Kīrar. But after all there is nothing in the name. We are just reminded here of the controversy whether the great author of the *Arthaśāstra* is Kauṭalya or Kauṭilya. We are not here concerned with the name of the poet but with his personality as exhibited in his writings at once inspiring and thought-provoking.

His Caste.—To what caste this poet gem belonged is still a moot point. There are two views. One is that

[1] *Iraiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ,* see the commentary on the first Sūtra, p. 7 Edition by Bavānandam Pillai.

[2] Ed. by Swāminātha Ayyar, ch. 15, st. 4.

he was a Brahman, and the other, that he was a Vēḷāḻa, by caste. The first is based on the authority of the *Aham.*[1]

But there are scholars who regard him as a Vēḷāḻa, by caste, belonging to the sub-community of Kaṇakkar or Karuṇīkar taking as their authority the *Śīrkaṇuṇīkar Purāṇam* popularly attributed to Nakkīrar.[2] In the commentary on the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ*, Nakkīrar is referred to as the son of Kaṇakkāyaṉār. According to the *Divākaram* the word Kaṇakkāyar means Ōtturaippōr, a teacher of the Śāstras. This interpretation is supported by the *Maṇimēkalai* where the term *Śamayakkaṇakkar* is rendered as a teacher of religion.[3] Again the term is used in this very sense in the *Nālaḍiyar*.[4] It is highly doubtful whether any definite conclusion can be drawn from such slender evidence. Whatever caste he may have belonged to, need not prevent us from giving a sketch of his life with which we are now concerned.

His Date.—No task is more difficult than an attempt to fix the chronological limits of this celebrated author. In fact we meet with this difficulty with regard to every ancient Tamil writer. There is again a view that there were two poets by name Nakkīrar in the Śaṅgam epoch itself. This is yet to be proved. A close examination of the internal evidence of his writings and of the contemporary

[1] *வேளாப் பார்ப்பான் வாளரந் துமித்த*
வளைகளைந் தொழிந்த கொழுந்தி னன்ன
Aham, 24, cf. *Sen Tamiḻ*, vol. vi, pp. 557-64.

[2] See Paṇḍit Vēnkaṭaswāmi Nāṭṭār's, *Nakkīrar.*

[3] Canto xxvii, 1. 2.

[4] *கற்றதூஉ மின்றிக் கணக்காயர் பாடத்தாற்*
பெற்றதாம் பேதையோர் சூத்திர—மற்றதனை
நல்லா ரிடைப்புக்கு நாணாது சொல்லித்தன்
புல்லறிவு காட்டி விடும்.

literature bears out the fact that the author must have flourished sometime in the middle of the second century A.D. His profound scholarship and the depth of his learning won for him many a laurel from his colleagues.

Nakkīrar and the Śaṅgam.—During his age was flourishing the Third Śaṅgam of traditional fame. It was an assembly of learned men of a high order. Nakkīrar was invited to preside over the deliberations of this august assembly of poets and poetesses. The Pāṇḍyan king Vaṅgya Cūḍāmaṇi, the Tamil form of 'Vaṁśa Cūḍāmaṇi' who was ruling at Madura[1] was attracted to this prince of poets, and he duly honoured him by conferring on him the highest honour which could be accorded to scholars of his standing. Nakkīrar got an enviable position in the Śaṅgam and enjoyed the love and esteem of the king so long as he held that office.[2] The place of honour, therefore, is rightly given to his work, namely, *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai* in the well-known collection of *Pattuppāṭṭu*[3] which forms an invaluable portion of the vast treasures of Tamil classical literature.

The Legend of open contest.—The following story[4] is narrated of him:

One evening when the Pāṇḍyan king with his queen was enjoying the soft and cool breeze, high on the flat of his palace buildings, he felt an overpoweringly sweet fragrance. He thought that it evidently proceeded from

[1] மன்னவர் மன்னன் வங்கிய சூடா மணிமாறன்
தென்னவ ராகித் திகிரி யுருட்டுநெ் தென்கூடன்
முன்னவ ரன்னங் கண்டறி யாத முடிக்கேற்பப்
பன்மலர் நல்கு நந்தனம் வைக்கும் பணிபூண்டான்.
Parañjōtimunivar, *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal* 52, st. 2.

[2] G. S. Duraiswamy, *Tamil Literature*, pp. 52-6.

[3] Ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar, Second Ed. (1918).

[4] See Parañjōtimunivar, *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal*, whole of Paṭalam, 52.

the queen's tresses of hair. But he was not sure of this for he knew that she was not decked with any flowers. Still he could not trace the source of the odour which continued to sweeten the whole atmosphere around. He grew inquisitive and resolved to refer the matter to the all-wise scholars of his Academy and ascertain the truth, if possible, from them. For this purpose he ordered a bag, containing a thousand pieces of gold, to be hung on the wall of the Śaṅgam hall and made it known to the public by beat of *tom tom,* that whoever should enlighten him as to what he had in his mind and resolve his doubt, would be entitled to that bag of gold. The news spread like wild fire in all parts of the city, not excluding its suburbs. Day after day poet after poet flocked to the hall of the Academy, each anxious to win the prize. Every one had his say, but no one could correctly spot what the king actually had in his mind. They all went away disappointed, as none of these poetical conjectures satisfactorily solved the king's doubt.

Thus several days passed by and the bag of gold was still found hanging in the same old place. There was at this time living in Madura a poor Brahman youth named Darumi, belonging to a family hereditarily entitled to perform the daily worship (*pūjā*) in the temple of Śrī Sundarēśvarar. He was so poor that no one offered his daughter in marriage to him though he much wished for it, because only thus could he become fit to perform the regular *pūjā.* He hoped that with the grace of Śrī Sundarēśvarar he would get at the correct solution which would satisfy the king and thus he might acquire the coveted prize which would secure for him a good social standing in his community. Engrossed with such ideas Darumi entered the temple, stood before the deity, and prayed earnestly for grace. No wonder, the

Lord was moved by his unflinching devotion and steadfast love, and spoke out in such a manner that he could hear the verse which he longed for. He anxiously and carefully took down what came out from the Lord's lips. His joy knew no bounds. He ran in breathless haste to the Śaṅgam Hall, repeated the verse[1] before the august assembly, and the king was quite satisfied with it. In substance it amounted to this, namely, that the sweet fragrance emanated from the locks of the queen herself. The king immediately ordered that the reward might be granted to him, subject, however, to the approval of the same by the learned members of the Śaṅgam. All of them except Nakkīrar highly extolled the verse and agreed to the award of the prize to Darumi. But Nakkīrar did not agree.

His Obstinacy.—He boldly challenged that the verse was faulty in ideas. This was, indeed, a bolt from the blue for the poor Darumi. He could not certainly believe his own eyes or ears, for he was greatly puzzled and perplexed as to how the Lord's own verse could be wrong. Yet he dared not question the verdict of the poet, for he was not himself a man of letters. When he was told that the prize could not be given to him, all his great hopes crumbled to pieces. He had no other course than to approach the Lord once again and report what had occurred, and solicit his help by more earnest prayers. Hearing his piteous plaint the Lord assumed the guise of an ordinary Paṇdit, entered the assembly, and questioned the challenger about the *raison d'etre* of his

1 கொங்குதேர் வாழ்க்கை யஞ்சிறைத் தும்பி
காமஞ் செப்பாது கண்டது மொழிமோ
பயிலியது கெழீஇய நட்பின் மயிலியற்
செறி யெயிற் றரிவை கூந்தலி
னறியவு முளவோ நீயறியும் பூவே. *Kuruntogai*, st. 2.

objection to Darumi's verse. Nakkīrar replied that the statement therein that there was no flower so fragrant as the tresses of a high-born maiden, was opposed to truth. The God-poet asked if the objection stood even against the tresses of divine damsels. Nakkīrar readily replied that it was even so. The God, in a wrathful tone, then, asked if there could be no inherent natural fragrance even in the raven locks of the Goddess Pārvatī. The cantankerous critic undauntedly retorted that even the fragrance of Her locks was only acquired. The God-poet throwing off His disguise stood before him in His true form. Infatuated with the pride of learning, our poet would not even then yield, and reiterated fearlessly that, whoever he might be, the mistake was a mistake.

Nakkīrar Humiliated.—The Lord wanted to teach him the lesson of humility and in the expression of the *Bhagavadgītā* to make him *Vidyāvinayasampanna*. There was certainly *vidyā* but there was no *vinaya*. Such overwhelming self-conceit is the great blot of learning. The Lord in an outburst of anger opened His fiery eye on poor Nakkīrar. It caused him such unbearable agony that he drowned himself in the temple-tank in order to assuage the heat of his burning body.[1] Soon he was rescued but got stricken with an incurable disease. The pride of Nakkīrar was thus humbled, and then alone did he realize his foolish obstinacy in throwing out a challenge even to the Lord. He stood a suppliant before the Lord, confessed his guilt and sincerely repented for his fault. The Lord who is a *śaraṇāgatavatsala* readily forgave him and blessed that he would be rid of his malady if he would but pay a visit to the Kailāsa hills.

[1] *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal*, Paṭalam, 53.

He received this order with bowed head and proceeded fast towards the sacred hills.

Another Legend.—On his way thither another strange incident occurred. Once while[1] he was engaged in offering worship to the Lord on the bank of a tank under the shadow of a tree, down fell a leaf, half of it touching the water and the other half, the earth. Soon the former became transformed into a fish and the latter into a bird. This distracted his attention. When he was looking on this strange phenomenon, there appeared a huge monster who had been authorized to devour a thousand guilty souls. It had already secured 999 men and secreted them in his cave and had been long eagerly waiting for the last. It at once carried him off to the cave and having immured him along with the others, went out to bathe before taking his unholy dinner. To effect their release Nakkīrar sang a poem—invoking the help of Lord Subrahmaṇya—well-known as *Tirumurugārruppadai* consisting of 315 lines pregnant with meaning. These are to-day read and re-read and committed to memory by all true devotees of the War-God. Ṣaṇmukha appeared, killed the monster, and released them all. Then, blessed by Subrahmaṇya, he proceeded to Kālahasti where the disease left him for good. Afterwards he returned to Madura and was more honoured than ever before.

Sometime afterwards it is said that the Lord in order to perfect his knowledge of *Poruḷ Ilakkaṇam* asked Agastya to teach him the same. Thus taught and having acquired thorough proficiency therein, he was able later on to write his celebrated commentary on the *Iṛaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ,* a prose work of outstanding literary merit. Loved by the king and esteemed by his

[1] *Sīkālattipurāṇam, Nakkīraccarukkam,* st. 98 ff.

colleagues as a great poet and critic, he seems to have died full of years and honour.[1]

The life of this poet conveys this important message to us. However much men may be learned, learning will not be fruitful if it is not accompanied by humility or *Upaśama* to use the expression of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya.

Sec. II. KAPILAR

A Popular Poet.—Kapilar is yet another celebrity of the Śaṅgam. What is remarkable about him is that Nakkīrar with all his overweening pride speaks in eloquent terms about him. He says[2] that his powers of speech were so great and instructive that he evoked esteem and praise from the whole Tamil world. Kapilar seems to have been a poets' poet. Poets who wielded much influence in the Śaṅgam have given due praise to his great parts. Besides Nakkīrar whom we have already mentioned, others like Peruṁkuṉṟūr Kiḻār,[3] Nappacalaiyār,[4] and Avvaiyar[5] speak in respectful terms about him. It would thus appear that he was a very popular poet in his days, and perhaps as popular as Tiruvaḷḷuvar. There is further evidence to show that he was a great friend and companion of Paraṇar of whom we shall speak next. The names of Kapilar and Paraṇar often occur side by side in the Tamil literary texts.

His Caste.—That Kapilar was a Brahman by caste is clear from two verses in the *Puṟam.*[6] He was

[1] See Paṭalam, 54.

[2] உலகுடன் றிரிதரும் பலர்புகழ் நல்லிசை
வாய்மொழிக் கபிலன் *Aham*, 78, ll. 15-16.

[3] *Padiṟṟuppattu*, 85. 'நல்லிசைக்கபிலன்', ll. 12-13.

[4] *Puṟam*, 174.

[5] *Aham*, 303.

[6] யானே, பரிசிலன் மன்னு மந்தணன் *Puṟam*, 200, l. 13.
தந்தை தோழ னிவரென் மகளி
ரந்தணன் புலவன் கொண்டுவந் தனனே *Ibid.*, 201, ll. 6-7.

born in Tiruvādavūr in the Pāṇḍyan Kingdom.[1] Before we proceed further in the sketch of his life it would not be out of place to refer to the account contained in what is known as the *Kapilar Ahaval* said to have been written by Kapilar himself. This is clearly a spurious work of very much later times and could not be credited with much authority since it is said there that he was a brother of Tiruvaḷḷuvar and Avvaiyār and that the latter had three other sisters, Uppai, Uṛuvai and Vaḷḷi. There is nothing to corroborate this.

The Date.—The age of this poet is still a puzzle. But we may approximately fix it towards the close of the first century and the beginning of the second century A.D. He was at least a contemporary of Nakkīrar.

Royal Patronage.—It would appear that he underwent education and discipline under a learned ācārya who seems to have been much struck by his quick grasp and sparkling intelligence.[2] When the course of his studies was over, Kapilar entered the royal Academy of learning under the distinguished Pāṇḍyan patronage. He soon won the love and esteem of his brother poets and became a friend of the king himself who was much pleased with the display of his striking originality, his verses containing lofty thoughts and noble ideas couched at once in the most subtle and wonderfully facile expressions.

The story of Pirakattaṉ.—When he was thus spending his time happily in the royal Court, there came to Madura a northern King Pirakattaṉ or Brahmadatta by name.[3] It seems that Pirakattaṉ had no high regard for Tamil poetry. This Kapilar noticed and wanted to introduce him to the beauties and glories of this ancient

[1] Old *Tiruviḷaiyādal* 27, 1, 4.
[2] See Vēnkaṭaswāmi Nāṭṭār's *Kapilar*, p. 30 ff. (1921). See also *Tamil Nāvalar Caritam*, p. 7.
[3] See Preface, p. 22 of *Pattuppāṭṭu*, edited by Swāminātha Ayyar.

literature. This he did by composing and singing to him the poem known as *Kuriñjippāṭṭu*, the eighth in the *Pattuppāṭṭu* collection. Pirakattan̠ was so much taken up with it that he soon became a devoted student of Tamil as is evident from a poem of his found in the collection known as *Kuruntogai*.[1]

With Pāri.—Sometime afterwards Kapilar seems to have left the Pāṇḍyan capital and gone on an extentive tour to the other parts of the country where lived chieftains of small territories enjoying absolute independence. Of these the most prominent and the most learned was Pāri. Having heard of his learning and his regard for learned men, Kapilar proceeded towards his city which was protected by an impregnable fortress surrounded by high and unscalable walls. Pāri's rule extended over nearly three hundred villages.[2] With him he spent a few days composing songs in praise of his achievements.

With Pēkan̠.—The next royal chieftain visited by our poet was Vēḷ Pēkan̠, by name, the ruler of a mountain tract known as Kalnāḍu.[3] This chieftain of the Āviyar clan[4] was not leading the proper life of a householder. He was in love with a dancing girl of the place, caring little for his virtuous wife. This lady was a *pativratā śirōmaṇi.* Public sympathy went towards her; but none dared to approach Pēkan̠, the ruler of the place. There was only one privileged class of people, namely, the bards and poets who could speak to him without any fear or favour.

Hers was a sacred cause. It was a deserving case. So some influential poets under the powerful leadership of Kapilar managed it in such a manner that Pēkan̠

1 St. 184.
2 *Puram,* 105-109.
3 பெருங்கனுடன் பேகனும் *Siṛupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai,* 1. 87.
4 *Aham,* 262.

began to realize his folly and evinced a desire to pursue the righteous path.[1] From that day forward Pēkaṉ became the most devoted husband of the queen. This service of Kapilar to advance righteousness is highly commendable.

With Kāri.—Leaving Pēkaṉ, Kapilar went next to Malayamāṉ Tirumuḍikkāri, the chieftain of Tirukkōyilūr, on the river Peṇṇaiyār. He was a great soldier and a sound statesman. His war-horse was also known as Kāri.[2] It is said that he killed in battle, Ōri, an equally well-known chieftain.[3] He won the love and esteem of the learned and the poor by his liberal gifts and presents, and is justly celebrated as one of the seven great chieftains noted for their munificent liberality.[4] Need it be said that Kapilar was accorded due welcome and given rich presents by Kāri?[5]

Back to the Court of Pāri.—Sometime later he seems to have returned to Parumbunāḍu, the kingdom of Vēḷ Pāri. And Pāri was naturally overjoyed to see his revered master once again. Kapilar was so much enamoured of the great qualities of his head and heart that he resolved to spend the rest of his life at his Court. To the great joy of Pāri, both of them continued to spend their time together on useful purposes. Once it happened that some three kings, perhaps his own neighbours, wanted his daughter to be given in marriage to one of them and on his refusal attacked him by besieging his capital. The siege dragged on for several months and yet there was no prospect of the fortress falling. Pāri's soldiers who

[1] *Puṟam,* 143: 144-7; see also *Vēḷir Varalāṟu*, pp. 40-44.
[2] *Siṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai,* ll. 110-11; *Naṟṟiṇai*, 291.
[3] *Naṟṟiṇai,* 320.
[4] *Siṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai,* l. 113.
[5] *Puṟam,* 121-4.

garrisoned the fortress resisted with persistence and with success, all the time encouraged by the spirited words of Kapilar.[1] The poet devised ways and means for ensuring an unfailing supply of food for the inhabitants inside the fortress. Kapilar himself appeared before the besiegers and spoke to them of their fruitless attempts to take the city by storm, and persuaded them to desist from further endeavours. When the enemy kings learnt that Pāri was then the lord of only Paṛambu hill, having already given the rest of his kingdom away, they surrounded and attacked the Paṛambu hill, his last remaining territory and killed him and took possession of it.[2] Pāri's death brought darkness to Kapilar's mind where once reigned the illustrious sunshine. For, as a loyal friend of Pāri, a new and heavy responsibility now fell on his shoulders. Pāri had left two daughters who were yet unmarried.[3] Those were days when a special sanctity was attached to the institution of marriage. The marriage problem is always a knotty one, and poor Kapilar was faced with it. The real difficulty was to find suitable husbands becoming the status of the young ladies. Still he was not discouraged. In the first instance he took them to the royal chieftain Viccikkōṉ[4] and proposed their marriage. On his refusal, he next took them to

[1] *Puṛam*, 105 ff.

[2] *Ibid.*, 110-12.

[3] மட்டுவாய் திறப்பவு மைவிடை வீழ்ப்பவு
மட்டான் றூனாக் கொழுந்துவை யூன்சோறும்
பெட்டாங் கீயும் பெருவளம் பழுனி
நட்டனை மன்றே முன்னே யினியே
பாரி மாய்ந்தெனக் கலங்கிக் கையற்று
நீர்வார் கண்ணேந் தொழுதுநிற் பழிச்சிச்
சேறும் வாழியோ பெரும்பெயர்ப் பறம்பே
கோறிரண் முன்கைக் குறுந்தொடி மகளிர்
நாறிருங் கூந்தற் கிழவரைப் படர்ந்தே. *Ibid.*, 113.

[4] *Puṛam*, 200.

Iruṅgōvēḷ. He also did not countenance the proposal and this threw him into a state of wrathful disdain against him.[1] Perhaps after similar other attempts he reached Tirukkōyilūr where it is believed he placed the royal maidens under custody of a member of the Brahman community.[2] Again according to the account given in the *Tamil Nāvalar Caritam*, it was the poetess Avvaiyār who effected the marriage of Pāri's daughters to one Daivīkaṉ, possibly son of Malayamāṉ Tirumuḍikkāri in Tirukkōyilūr.[3] The Tirukkōyilūr Inscription of Rājarāja Cōḷa I throws some light on this.[4]

With the Cēra King.—It would appear that Kapilar then went to the Cēra King Śelvakkaḍuṅgō-vāḻiyātaṉ. The Seventh Ten in *Padiṟṟuppattu* is said to have been sung in the immediate presence of the king who rewarded him with lands and gold.[5]

His last days.—Kapilar lived there for sometime, but the death of his much-lamented friend Pāri so grieved him that he made up his mind not to survive him. It is said that he starved himself to death on this account,[6]

[1] *Puram*, 201-202.

[2] See colophon to *Puṟam*, 236 and 113.

[3] P. 20 edited by T. Kaṉakasundaram Pillai (1921). Cf. *Puṟam*, 337.

[4]
வன்கரை பொருது வருபுனற் பெண்ணைத்
தென்கரை யுள்ளது தீர்த்தத் துறையது
மொய்வைத் தியலு முத்தமிழ் நான்மைத்
தெய்வக் கவிதைச் செஞ்சொற் கபிலன்
மூரிவண் டடக்கைப் பாரிதன டைக்கலப்
பெண்ணை மலையர்க் குதவிப் பெண்ணை
யலைபுன லழுவத் தந்தரி கஷஞ்செல
மினல்புகும் வீசும்பின் வீடுபெ றெண்ணிக்
கனல்புகுங் கபிலக் கல்லது; புனல்வளர்
பேரொட்டான வீரட்டான
மனைத்தினு மநுதி யாயது.

S.I.I. VII. No. 863: A.R. No. 236 of 1902,

[5] P. 64, see also *Puṟam*, 8 and 14.

[6] வடக்கிருந்த கபிலர், in the colophon to the *Puṟam*, 236—*prāyōpavēśam* in Sanskrit.

reminding us of the peculiar Jain custom of giving up one's life. According to the Tirukkōyilūr inscription, he entered fire and thus brought about his own death.

His Works.—The various poems attributed to this great poet are mostly found scattered in the well-known collections such as *Ahanāṉūṟu, Puṟanāṉūṟu, Kuṟuṅtogai* and *Naṟṟiṇai.* Further his writings form an important portion in the *Padiṟṟuppattu* known as the Seventh Ten. In *Padineṇkīḻkkaṇakku*, the work known as *Iṉṉā Nāṟpadu* is ascribed to him. There are several other poems such as *Kuṟiñjippāṭṭu,* consisting of 100 stanzas being the third section of *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* attributed to him. Of these the *Kuṟiñjippāṭṭu* forms the eighth of the collection called the *Pattuppāṭṭu.* It has already been pointed out that it was sung in order to introduce the Āryan King Pirakattaṉ to the beauties of Tamil literature. The *Kuṟiñjikkali* forms the second section of *Kalittogai,* one of the eight collections (*Eṭṭuttogai*). If the greatness of a poet can be judged by the extent of his original writings, surely Kapilar is entitled to the foremost place in that category.

Sec. III. PARAṈAR

A Contemporary of Kapilar.—There are unquestionable pieces of evidence to demonstrate that one of the great luminaries that shone in the famous academic assembly hall of the Pāṇḍyas was the great and highly distinguished poet Paraṇar. That Paraṇar enjoyed that rare place of honour and distinction which but a very few enjoyed, is undoubted. Whenever Kapilar is mentioned, especially with regard to his activities in the Pāṇḍyan capital, Paraṇar is also mentioned.[1] This shows that Paraṇar occupied a place

[1] See *supra*, p. 53.

equal to, if not, superior to, that of Kapilar. This also bears out the fact that Paraṇar was a contemporary of Kapilar and whichever date scholars deem fit to assign to this poet is equally applicable to Paraṇar.[1] That Paraṇar lived with him, moved with him and composed some of his writings in his company, no one can deny.

His Relations with Pēkaṉ.—Mention has already been made in our sketch on the life of Kapilar of a chieftain named Vaiyāvikkōp-Peruṁ-Pēkaṉ, or simply Pēkaṉ, who treated with contempt his virtuous wife Kaṇṇaki and bestowed his love on a dancing girl. To wean him from this evil conduct the services of Kapilar were requisitioned as was already said.[2] Paraṇar was among the poets who waited in deputation on this king. Both these poets are said to have addressed him some verses found in the extant *Puṟanāṉūṟu.* Of these, the verses 141 and 142 are ascribed to Paraṇar as well as verses 144 and 145. These are in the form of advice to Pēkaṉ especially with regard to his duty towards his devoted wife.

His reference to Neḍumāṉ Añji.—From a verse[3] ascribed to Avvaiyār the great poetess of the Tamil land, Paraṇar appears to have spoken very highly of Adigamāṉ Neḍumāṉ Añji, the powerful chieftain of those times. It is well known that Avvaiyār spent the best part of her life in the Court of this prince and hence what she says about him could be utilized even for historical purposes, for she certainly speaks with first-hand knowledge. Therefore there is reason to think with Mr. Kanakasabai that Paraṇar must have been present when Kōvalūr, the

[1] For a full discussion of the Age of Paraṇar, see Dr. S. K. Aiyangar, *Beginnings of S. I. History,* Ch. v.

[2] See *supra,* p. 55.

[3] இன்றும் பாணன் பாடினன் மற்கொன் *Puṟam,* 99, esp. 1, 12.

capital city of Kāri, was attacked and stormed by Neḍumāṉ Añji.[1]

The battle between the Cēra and the Cōḻa described.—There is besides evidence to indicate that Paraṇar was a wide traveller and especially visited the royal Courts of the Cēra, Cōḻa, Pāṇḍya and the independent chieftains of smaller Kingdoms. He seems to have witnessed many a battle-field both during the course of an action and after it. Once there was a battle between Kuḍakkō Neḍuñcēralātaṉ, the Cēra king and Vēṟpahṟaṭakkaip-Peruviṟaṟ kiḷḷi, the Cōḻa king. To this Kaḷāttalaiyār has referred in verse 62 of the *Puṟam.* In the next verse[2] we find Paraṇar describing the battle-field. The description gives us an idea of the military operations in the Tamil land in very early times. It is said that a large number of elephants wounded by sharp arrows lay dead or disabled. Well-trained horses with soldiers on them were found dead in large numbers. Those who fought from chariots were killed, and the chariots themselves

[1] *Puṟam,* 99; see also *Aham,* 372; *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago,* p. 108.

[2] எனைப்பல் யானையு மம்பொடு துளங்கி
விளைக்கும் வினையின்றிப் படையொழிந் தனவே
விறற் புகழ் மாண்ட புரவி யெல்லா
மறத்தகை மைந்தரொ டாண்டுப்பட் டனவே
தேர்தர வந்த சான்றோ ரெல்லாந்
தோல்கண் மறைப்ப வொருங்குமாய்ந் தனரே
விசித்துவினை மாண்ட மயிர்க்கண் முரசம்
பொறுக்குந ரின்மையி னிருந்துவிளிந் தனவே
சாந்தமை மார்பி னெடுவேல் பாய்ந்தென
வேந்தரும் பொருதுகளத் தொழிந்தன ரினியே
யென்னா வதுகொ றானே கழனி
யாம்பல் வள்ளித் தொடிக்கை மகளிர்
பாசவன் முக்கித் தண்புனற் பாயும்
யாணர் அறாஅ வைப்பிற்
காமர் கிடக்கைய வகன்றலை நாடே. *Puṟam,* 63; see also 141-2.

shattered to pieces. The commanders and soldiers were all arrayed in military equipment for both offensive and defensive purposes. The kings met heroic death with their chests pierced by long lances. On all sides were found scattered big war-drums. This is a digression introduced to show which instruments of war were used and how the battle was fought.

Some princes sung by him.—To pass on to the subject proper, from the various verses found in the collection of *Puṟanāṉūṟu,* it seems that Paraṇar had visited a number of kings and sung in their praise. To mention a few of them would not be out of place here. He has sung in praise of Uruvappahṟēr Iḷañjēt Ceṉṉi, the father of Karikāṟcōḻan,[1] Neḍuñcēralātan the king of the Cēras[2] as well as Peruviṟaṟkkiḷḷi the Cōḻa to whom we have already referred, Perumpēkaṉ[3] and Velkeḻukuṭṭuvaṉ (Śenguṭṭuvaṉ).[4] Velkēḻukuṭṭuvaṉ seems to have been a great warrior winning laurels wherever he fought. Paraṇar pays a well-deserved tribute to his feats and in a particular verse[5] asks for elephants as presents from him. Paraṇar has a wonderful facility of expression couched in metaphorical language. He is as much a man of the country as of the city. In describing the battle-field he compares it to a corn-field. The elephants are the sable clouds; the swift-footed horses are the winds; the chariots are the ploughing machines; the rain drops are the showers of arrows; the muddy water is the

[1] See also *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai* of Muḍāttamakkaṇṇiyār where the term உருவப் பஃறே ரிளையோன் சிறுவன் occurs. *Puram,* 4.

[2] *Ibid.,* 63.

[3] *Ibid.,* 141-5.

[4] *Ibid.,* 343 and 369.

[5] ஓடை நுதல வொல்குத லறியாத்
துடியடிக் குழவிய பிடியிடை மிடைந்த
வேழ முகவை நல்குமதி
தாழா வீகைத் தகைவெய் யோயே. *Puram,* 369.

river of blood and flesh in the field of battle; the weeds that are ploughed off are the chopped-off heads of the soldiers, etc. The power of thus vividly describing a thing with a wealth of detail is one of the characteristics of Paraṇar and this he has exhibited here splendidly. The same kind of description is given about Muśiri (Mouziris of Pliny) the great trading centre belonging to Kuṭṭuvaṉ[1]

His reference to Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ.—Again he seems to have enjoyed the favour of Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ[2] about whom he is said to have sung the ten stanzas of the Fifth Ten in *Padiṟṟuppattu*, one of the eight collections known as the *Eṭṭuttogai*.[3] This is clear from the colophon at the end of the Fifth Ten of the above work.[4] Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ seems to have been a great king. He possessed a huge army and a naval force. He had extensive commerce both by sea and land. Paraṇar sang these verses in his honour and in return got from him as present *Umbaṟkāṭṭuvāri* (the revenues accruing from a particular territory known as *umbaṟkāḍu*, literally, elephant forests, included in the Malaināḍu), as well as his son Kuṭṭuvaṉcēraṉ. To hazard a conjecture, the presenting of the royal prince means that the king entrusted his son for instruction and education to the poet Paraṇar on whom he seems to have bestowed great confidence and

[1] *Puram*, 343.

[2] கடல்பிறக்கோட்டிய செங்குட்டுவன்

[3] *Padiṟṟuppattu*, pp. 60-79 (1920). Dr. S. K. Ayyangar identifies this *Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ* with that name in the twin epics, Śilappadikāram and Maṇimēkalai (see *Beginnings of S. I. History*, pp. 213-4). See also *Cēraṉ Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ*, pp. 29-30.

[4] கடல்பிறக் கோட்டிய செங்குட்டுவனைக் கரணமமைந்த காசறு செய்யுட்பரணர் பாடினார் பத்துப்பாட்டு; அவைதாம்: சுடர்வீ வேங்கை, தசும்பு துளங்கிருக்கை, ஏறுவேணி, நோய்தபு நோன்றொடை, ஊன்றுவை யடிசில், கரைவாய்ப்பருதி, நன்னுதல் விறலியர், பேரெழில் வாழ்க்கை, செங்கை மறவர், வெருவரு புனற்றார். இவைபாட்டின் பதிகம்.

love. Such has been the powerful influence wielded by this poet. Both the old and the new *Tiruviḷaiyāḍals* make distinct references to him.[1] His works other than those found in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and the *Padiṟṟup-pattu* are twelve verses in the *Naṟṟiṇai* and fifteen in the *Kuṟuntogai.*

References to other Kings.—Paraṇar refers to the defeat of nine kings by Karikāṟcōḷaṉ.[2] Further in the *Aham* (396) the exploits as well as the victory of Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ over certain Northern kings are mentioned. There is also in it a reference to Tittaṉ the chieftain of Uṟaiyūr surrounded by poets[3] especially on account of his liberality and valour.[4] From these it can be safely concluded that Paraṇar must have been a great power in the realm of literature in the heyday of the so-called third Śaṅgam.

His Caste and Religion.—The materials available are too scanty to attempt anything like a history of this poet. We are not in a position to ascertain the caste or community to which he belonged. There is evidence to show that he embraced Śaivism as his religion. Scholars opine, says Paṇḍit Swāminātha Ayyar, that he may be identified with Paraṇadēvanāyaṉār, in *Śivaperumāṉ Tiruvantāti,*[5] one of the works included in the eleventh *Tirumuṟai.* From the fact that certain works of Nakkīradēvar, Kapilardēvar, and Paraṇardēvar are included in this work in the above order, the surmise ventured upon by the learned Mahāmahōpādhyāya seems almost tantamount to a certainty. But this is left for future research to determine.

[1] Ch. 15, st. 4; ch. 59, st. 27.
[2] *Aham,* 125; see Kanakasabai, *Tamils 1800 Years Ago,* p. 67 (1904).
[3] *Ibid.,* 122.
[4] *Ibid.,* 6; also 152, ll. 5-7; 226, ll. 14-17.
[5] See Intro., p. 11 of *Padiṟṟuppattu*: *Śivaperumāṉ Tiruvantāti,* edited by Arumuganāvalar, Madras (Third edition).

Sec. IV. AVVAIYĀR

A Śaṅgam Celebrity.—Tamil Nāḍu was not lacking in eminent poetesses who were widely celebrated for their learning. The country could count with pride a number of poetesses who were equal in influence and fame to the distinguished poets in this part of the Bhāratavarṣa. Among them Avvaiyār was an honoured Śaṅgam celebrity. In our study on Kapilar[1] we had occasion to refer to what is now current as *Kapilar Ahaval.* It has been already said that there is no foundation whatever to identify the work with the great name of the Śaṅgam poet. The account given there is that Avvaiyār was a sister of Kapilar, Tiruvaḷḷuvar, and Adigamāṉ and this does not fit in with the references found in classical Tamil literature. As already pointed out Kapilar was a Brahman by birth, Vaḷḷuvar an agriculturist?, and Adigamāṉ, a Maḻava warrior and hence they belonged to separate communities. Lines of demarcation are clear among these. That she belonged to the Pāṇar caste and was a *Viṛali* by profession is clear from the *Puṛam.*[2] A *Viṛali* is a female singer versed in the art of bringing out the underlying emotion and feelings of a song by means of appropriate gestures.[3]

Her Early Life.—Paṇḍit R. Rāghava Ayyangar, sometime editor *Sen Tamiḻ,* (a monthly published in Madura) has written a short life of Avvaiyār in Tamil in Vol. II, (6) of that Journal. There is also an able and critical study of her life by Mr. S. Anavaratavināyagam Pillai.[4]

[1] See *supra,* p. 54.
[2] Verse 89.
[3] For the meaning of the term *viral* see Aḍiyārkkunallār's comment on the *Silappadikāram,* pp. 106 and 110.
[4] Published by C. Coomaraswami Naidu and Sons, Madras (1919).

At the outset it may be pointed out that there was not merely one poetess by the name of Avvaiyār but that there seem to have been several who bore that honoured name. Whatever be the number, the fact of the matter is that there was an Avvaiyār, a celebrated Śaṅgam poetess living two thousand years ago roughly, who was very possibly a contemporary of Kapilar. The term *Avvai* is a significant term and means on old lady, a venerable and aged matron. Tradition says that this accomplished poetess led a life of peace and happiness living as a spinster throughout her life. At least there is no evidence to show that she was ever married. From her girlhood she seems to have devoted her full attention to deep study and high thinking with its necessary accompaniment of plain living according to such standards as then obtained. Her writings are varied and many, scattered throughout the voluminous pages of *Naṟṟiṇai, Kuṟuntogai, Puṟanāṉūṟu* and *Ahanāṉūṟu.*

With Adigamāṉ Neḍumāṉ Añji.—Avvaiyār seems to have spent a good portion of her life in the Court of Adigamāṉ Neḍumāṉ Añji who was the reigning chief at Takaḍūr now identified with Dharmapuri in the Salem District. Añji was a great warrior.[1] He was related to Cēramāṉ, the king of the Cēras. He was such a powerful and great chieftain that he was able to inflict a crushing defeat on the combined forces of seven princes of seven principalities. These seven kings were the Cēra, Cōḻa, Pāṇḍya, Titiyaṉ, Erumaiyūraṉ, Iruṅkōvēṇmāṉ, and Porunaṉ.[2] But he was defeated in his turn by his relatives and the king Cēramāṉ,

[1] *Puṟam,* 87-9, and 90 (மழவர் பெருமகன்) pp. 166 and 168.

[2] See p. 57 Into. *Puṟanāṉūṟu,* edited by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

as will be seen from the colophon at the end of the Eighth Ten in the *Padiṟṟuppattu.*[1]

With Adigamāṉ Añji.—It is seen from the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* that she was greatly attached to and was well beloved of Adigamāṉ Añji in whose praise she has sung a number of poems. The king was so much pleased with her performances that he once presented her with the *nelli* fruit (*emblic myrobalan*), a fruit that would endow one who took it with long and healthy life. Such presents were rare and given only to select persons. Avvaiyār ate this fruit of rare virtue and became very happy. She has given vent to her feelings of extreme happiness on this.[2] It is also referred to by Parimēlaḻagar in his much celebrated commentary on the great work of morals.[3] Further her inspiring intelligence and keen grasp struck Añji so much that he entrusted her with important missions to alien courts. Once she was sent as an ambassador—of course in the wide sense of the term—, to the Court of the Toṇḍaimāṉ, king of Kāñci.[4] This, the late Kanakasabai thinks[5], may have been for the purpose of soliciting his assistance against his enemies.

[1] பொய்யில் செல்வக் கடுங்கோ வுக்கு
வேளாவிக் கோமான் பதுமன் றேவியீன்றமகன்
கொல்லிக் கூற்றத்து நீர்கூர் மீமிசைப்
பல்வேற் றானை யதிக மானோ
டிருபெரு வேந்தரையு முடனிலை வென்று
முரசுங் குடையுங் கலனுங்கொண்
டுரைசால் சிறப்பி னடுகளம் வேட்டுத்
துகடீர் மகளி ரிரங்கத் துப்பறுத்துத்
தகடூ ரெறிந்து நொச்சிதந் தெய்திய
அருந்திற லொள்ளிசைப் பெருஞ்சே ரிரும்பொறையை
மறுவில் வாய்மொழி யரிசில்கிழார் பாடினார் பத்துப்பாட்டு.

[2] *Puṟam,* 91.

[3] See the comment on the *Kuṟaḷ veṇbā,* 100.

[4] *Puṟam,* 95 *colophon.* அவன் தூதுவிடத் தொண்டமானுழைச் சென்ற ஔவைக்கு அவன் படைக்கலக்கொட்டில்காட்ட அவர் பாடியது.

[5] *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago,* pp. 204-5.

With Elini.—But soon the sun of Adigamān set. After his death perhaps as the result of a mortal wound received in a battle, referred to by the poetess in *Puram* 93,[1] sorrow completely clouded her heart. She bemoaned the loss of her warm and generous patron[2] who esteemed her at once for her wide scholarship and skill. She left the place in great sorrow, wandered far and wide in the Tamil Nāḍu, and finally returned to Takaḍūr where Pokuṭṭelini, the son of the late chieftain Añji, accorded her a right royal welcome. As his father was devoted to her, so also was Elini because he full well knew her great parts. No wonder he respected her accordingly. He presented her with new clothes, old liquor, and treated her to a sumptuous feast worthy of a great poetess.[3] In this connection a word may be said about the social condition of the age of Avvaiyār. It is obvious that kings and princes were addicted to liquor and the same was even offered to worthy guests like Avvaiyār. It must have been a common practice among only certain classes of peoples to drink liquor.

Other Chiefs and Patrons.—From a stanza (367) of the *Puram* and the colophon[4] at the end of it we find that she has sung of Cēramān Mārivengō, Pāṇḍyan Ukkirap-peruvaluti, and Cōlan Perunarkkilli who had evidently congregated together on the occasion of the *Rājasūya* sacrifice[5] performed by the last of them. Thus though

1 பெருந்தகை விழுப்புண் பட்டமாறே, st. 93, l. 15.

2 *Puram,* 231-2 and 235.

3 *Ibid*, 392.

4 சேரமான் மாரிவெண்கோவும், பாண்டியன் கானப்பேர் தந்த உக்கிரப் பெருவழுதியும், சோழன் இராசசூயம் வேட்ட பெருநற்கிள்ளியும் ஒருங்கிருந்தாரை ஔவையார். (P. 482 of the *Puram,* second ed., 1923.)

5 The ancient Kṣatriya kings were expected to perform among others the *Aśvamēdha* and the *Rājasūya* sacrifices. Ancient Indian kings had been performing them ever since the Vēdic times. This practice however fell into desuetude with the extinction of the true Kṣatriya caste. The

she spent many of her days in the Court of Takaḍūr still she frequented the courts of the great Pāṇḍya, Cōḻa, and Cēra kings. It would appear that she was patronized by them.

A Popular Poetess.—Avvaiyār thus enjoyed great repute in all the Courts of the then kings in the Tamil land. Her poems simple but full of lofty maxims and practical wisdom caught the popular mind and she became thus a friend of the masses. And we must carefully make a distinction between this Avvaiyār and the other who flourished in the later centuries, as found in the *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam.*

The Editor of the Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam on the account.—The account given in the above book is so conflicting that the Editor in his well-written introduction[1] points out the different errors in a categorical list. First, in these verses there are lots of words beginning with the letter 'ca'. But in the Śaṅgam period such words were rare. According to the great grammar *Tolkāppiyam* such expressions were prohibited. And the use, therefore, is distinctly modern and could not at any rate belong to the Śaṅgam period. Secondly, Avvaiyār had nothing to do with the marriage of Pāri's daughters if the account given in *Puṟanāṉūṟu* could be treated as trustworthy. Thirdly, her Vināyaka Pūja and her being taken to Kailāsa by Vināyaka belongs to the realm of mythology. Fourthly, the Cēran who went to Kailāsa and whom Avvaiyār is said to have followed is quite different and this statement contradicts the account given in the *Periyapurāṇam,* roughly eleventh century A.D.[2] Lastly, in point of style,

very fact that the Cōḻa King performed this sacrifice shows that he must have been a powerful king enjoying a great and vast dominion besides immense wealth.

[1] P. 5 ff.

[2] For a critical study of the life and date of Śēkkiḻār, the author of the *Periyapurāṇam,* see Sōmasundara Dēśikar's *Śaiva Śikāmaṇikaḷ Iruvar* (1930).

diction, and metre, most of the verses attributed to Avvaiyār must have been composed by another of the same name about the tenth century A.D. These differences are enough to show that the Śaṅgam poetess is different from the later Avvaiyār about whom the *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam* speaks.

Sec. V. IḶAṄKŌ-AḌIGAḶ

A Prince Poet.—Iḷaṅkō-aḍigaḷ is the celebrated author of the *Śilappadikāram*[1] belonging to the category of the great Epics (*mahākāvyas*). He was not the ordinary bard wandering from Court to Court singing miscellaneous verses now in honour of this prince and then in honour of that. Iḷaṅkō was the son of a king. He was the second son of king Cēralātaṉ reigning in the city of Vañji (Karuvūr), the capital of the then Cēranāḍu and the younger brother of the famous king Cēraṉ Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ. On this account he was called *Ilaṅkō* or the younger prince and he was known as Iḷaṅkō-aḍigaḷ after his renunciation of royalty and assumption of holy orders.

His Conversion.—This young prince coming from such a distinguished family connected with the Cōḻas by marriage alliances, gave up the joys of life in the palace even when comparatively young and became an ascetic. It would be interesting here to narrate why and how he turned out to be a monk. This has been excellently answered in the text itself.[2] There once came to the Court of

[1] References are to the third edition (1927).

[2] நுங்கை தாணிழ லிருந்தோய் நின்னை
யரைசுவீற் றிருக்குந் திருப்பொறி யுண்டென்
றுரைசெய் தவன்மே லுருத்து நோக்கிக்
கொங்கவிழ் நறுந்தார்க் கொடித்தேர்த் தானைச்
செங்குட் டுவன்றன் செல்ல னீங்கப்
பகல்செல் வாயிற் படியோர் தம்மு
னகலிடப் பார மகல நீக்கிச்

Cēralātan an astrologer who predicted the immediate death of the king and the passing of the throne to Ilaṅkō, the younger son. This was uttered in the presence of both the royal princes. The elder received the news with great disappointment and the younger noticing his brother's sorrow wanted to get rid of the stumbling block which was himself. Hence he at once took to a life of asceticism, renouncing worldly pleasures in order to satisfy his brother's hopes and aspirations. Having thus assumed the role of what we would call a Sannyāsin, Ilaṅkō thought it improper to live in the palace in the midst of his kith and kin. So he left the palace and took up his residence without the city gates in the temple of Guṇavāyir-Kōṭṭam on the eastern side of the Capital, devoting his whole life to art and literature. And no wonder his secluded life afforded him a good opportunity and paved the way for his becoming an accomplished scholar as is clearly seen from this great epic. When his scholarship had reached such a high state of perfection that he considered himself competent to write out a classical work, he took the theme and the plot from real life. Unlike other poets of his age who looked for patronage to a king, Ilaṅkō confined himself to writing an epic. Probably he conceived at first the plan of writing two works, the *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai*.[1] Learning, however, from his friend and companion

சிந்தை செல்லாச் சேணெடுந் தூரத்
தந்தமி லின்பத் தரசாள் வேந்தென்
றென்றிற முரைத்த விமையோ ரிளங்கொடி
தன்றிற முரைத்த தகைசா னன்மொழி
தெரிவுறக் கேட்ட திருத்தகு நல்லீர்

Varantarukādai, 30, ll. 174-85.

[1] See the *Padikam* which is a prefatory poem forming an integral part of the work. The attribution of this prefatory part to Ilaṅkō himself is doubtful. It may be from the pen of Śāttanār. At the least it is earlier than the commentaries of Aḍiyārkkunallār and Arumpadavurai-āśiriyar.

Kūlavāṇikaṉ Śāttaṉār that he had taken up the *Maṇimēkalai* and even completed it, he gave up his original idea. From this it would appear that Iḷaṅkō was in constant touch with the scholars and writers of the day. He advised them and was advised by them in turn. In this way it is evident that Iḷaṅkō spent his days in the monastery.

His Religion.—It is equally interesting to examine what was his religion and the age when he might have probably lived. As to his religion there are conflicting opinions. Mr. Kanakasabai has written that Iḷaṅkō-aḍigaḷ became a monk of the Nigrantha sect.[1] The view that he was a Jain and belonged to Jainism is supported by the fact that he has elaborately referred to Jainism, its tenets and institutes. Further he was called Aḍigaḷ. Again the great commentator Aḍiyārkkunallār interprets Kōṭṭam in the line as *Aṇukaṉ-kōil* which is generally the name given to Jain temples. Against this it may be argued that the title Aḍigaḷ is common to all sects of the Hindus, and Kōṭṭam may mean any temple not necessarily the Jain temple. Paṇḍit Swāminātha Ayyar favours the view that Śaivism was his religion.[2] He quotes several texts from the work to show that both Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ and his brother must have been Śaivaites only. Wherever deities are mentioned, God Śiva is given the foremost place.[3] Again he says that his brother

[1] See *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago,* p. 208; cf. *Educa. Review,* April 1929. Prof. Rangācāriyar's article. From a frequent mention of a number of deities like Durgā, Indra, Balarāma, Śāttan, Murugan, etc., and of a system of image worship so commonly mentioned in the work and on the assumption that the system of worshipping images in temples was a feature of the post-Gupta period, Prof. Rangācāriyar concludes that this work was a composition of about A.D. 500, sometime before the epoch of the Nāyaṉmārs and the Aḷvārs, and sometime after the cessation of the third Academy.

[2] See his Intro., p. 17.

[3] Canto v. 169; Canto xiv. 1. 7.

Seṅguṭṭuvaṉ's birth is due to the grace of Śiva.[1] These bear unmistakable testimony to the fact that their religion must have been Śaivism. There are again elaborate references to legends gathered round Viṣṇu in regard to his *avatār* and other heroic deeds. The fact that Seṅguṭṭuvaṉ offered worship to both Śiva and Viṣṇu before his military expedition would bear the weight of testimony to conclude that the monarch was not necessarily a Śaivaite but a tolerant Hindu. But to conclude that he was a Jain from the mere fact that he elaborately treats of Jainism in his work is unconvincing. It may be that the wave of Jainism was spreading wide in his time and that a poet who was engaged in narrating contemporary facts could not but refer more than once to one and the same thing. What is remarkable is the author's tolerant attitude to the other sects in the land of his birth.

Date.—Much controversy has raged round the question of his date, and much has been written on it, and yet no general agreement has been reached. Without entering into the details, suffice it to say that from a careful study of the names of the kings and also of the names of the states mentioned therein, one cannot lend support to the opinion that it was the work of the seventh and the eighth century A.D. or even later. The following are some of the facts which go to assign an earlier date.[2]

There is first the evidence of the *Mahāvaṁśa* which speaks of the King of Ceylon, Gajabāhu who is said to have been present in the Court of Seṅguṭṭuvaṉ when he established a temple dedicated to Kaṇṇaki, the celebrated wife of Kōvalaṉ.[3]

[1] XXVI, ll. 98-9; XXX, ll. 141-2.

[2] See the learned discussion on the subject by Prof. V. Raṅgācāriyar in the *Educa. Review* (February 1929).

[3] *Silappadikāram, Varantarukādai*, XXX, l. 160, கடல்சூ ழிலங்கைக் கயவாகு வேந்தனும். S. K. Ayyangar, *Ancient India*, pp. 363-5.

No doubt the Buddhist books mention two Gajabāhus and one of them may be taken to have lived roughly in the first quarter of the second century A.D. somewhere about A.D. 113. The other Gajabāhu belongs to a very late century,—the twelfth century, and it would be nothing short of absurdity to take the composition of the work to such a late period. At least neither historical data nor religious nor even literary data would warrant such an assumption. A question has been raised: Could there not have been a Gajabāhu later than the one of the early second century who might have lived, say, in the fifth century or the sixth? Professor Rangācāriyar opines[1] that this is probable and draws attention to the minor Ceylon chronicles, the *Rājāvali* and *Rājaratnākari* which refer to a Gahaba whose successful expedition to the Tamil land is mentioned, with the assumption that Gahaba is a corruption of Gajabāhu. It seems to me that there is not much force in this argument because the chronicler of the *Mahāvaṁśa* unmistakably refers to the term Gajabāhu which is certainly different from Gahaba a quite different name.[2]

Secondly, Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ is mentioned as the ally of Nūṟṟuvar Kaṉṉar identified with the Śātakarṇis[3] of the Dekhan. The arguments of Mr. K. V. Subrahmaṇia Ayyar against this identification are not convincing.[4] K. G. Śēṣa Ayyar, on the other hand, identifies[5] this Nūṟṟuvarkaṉṉar with Yajñaśri and holds that the poem was probably written about A.D. 171.

Thirdly, Śāttaṉār is a Śaṅgam celebrity. Tradition narrates his friendship with Iḷaṅkō and his being the

[1] *Educa. Review*, February, 1929.

[2] *Cf.* K. G. Śaṅkara's article in the *Journal of the Mythic Society*, October, 1920.

[3] See Kanakasabai, *Tamils 1800 Years Ago*.

[4] See *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan*, p. 97.

[5] *Christian College Magazine*, September-October, 1917.

inspirer of the *Silappadikāram.* There is no warrant for the assumption that Śāttanār, the author of the *Maṇimēkalai* is a different person from the Śaṅgam poet bearing the same name. Hence both Śāttanār and Ilaṅkō were contemporaries of Śeṅguttuvan. Śeṅguttuvan figures prominently in the Śaṅgam works. The reference in the *Padirruppattu* has already been mentioned.[1] So also the reference in the *Aham.* Therefore it stands to reason that Śeṅguttuvan flourished in the heyday of the so-called third Academy. If we are to believe the authorship attributed to the twin works *Maṇimēkalai* and *Silappadikāram,* there is every justification to classify these works under the Śaṅgam category. This tradition of contemporaneity with the Śaṅgam period, it may be noted in passing, is accepted by later commentators.

Against this early date, astronomical data were pressed into service and a tentative date in the seventh or eighth century was arrived at. The late Swāmikaṇṇu Pillai relying chiefly on the evidence of the commentary of Aḍiyārkkunallār on a passage,[2] arrived at this date.[3] But this is questionable data in the light of other facts. For, first, the original on which the commentator bases his elaborate astronomical knowledge contains not the slightest reference even to concede the possibility of the view. Secondly, the calculation of figures, *nakṣatra,* etc., as given by the commentator is

[1] See *supra,* p. 29.

[2] வான்கண் விழியா வைகறை யாமத்து
மீன்றிகழ் விசும்பின் வெண்மதி நீங்கக்
காரிருணின்ற கடைநாட் கங்குல்
Nāḍu-Kān-Kādai, X, ll. 1-3, see also the appendix to ch. vii of S. K. Ayyangar's *Beginnings of South Indian History,* pp. 331-41.

[3] *Contra,* K. G. Śēṣa Ayyar: *The date of Silappadikāram, Madras Christian College Magazine,* September-October (1917). Mr. Śēṣa Ayyar proves Swāmikaṇṇu's arguments to be unsound.

faulty. Thirdly, the evidence of the commentary would enable us to fix Monday, the 17th May, A.D. 756 as the date, and this is not at all likely, considered from any point of view whatsoever. Fourthly, there is the mention of the week-day in the work. The destruction of Madura by the curse of Kaṇṇaki was on Friday.[1] The assumption is that the week-day names are used earliest in India in Budhagupta's inscription of A.D. 484.[2] It is difficult to say when the week-day as an item in the Tamiḻ calendar made its appearance though the fifth century A.D. is generally assigned to this. If this date were to be accepted, the mention of the week-day in the *Śilappadikāram* must be a later interpolation. Lastly, the astronomical data of the poem do not seem to be capable of being adduced as a serious argument to propound an important theory.

Literary Data.—Equally weak is the evidence afforded by the literary data in the *Śilappadikāram.* The author seems to be familiar with Sanskrit works like the *Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra,* the *Pañcatantra* and with the work *Karavaṭa* of Mūladēva on the science of theft. The date of these works is still a bone of contention among scholars. From one unknown to another unknown will be no serious argument. The use of a large number of Sanskrit words cannot be the last word on the subject as a good number of such words occur in the stanzas of the *Puṛam* and the *Aham,* the accredited works of the Śaṅgam.

1 ஆடித் திங்கட் பேரிருட் பக்கத்
தழல்சேர் குட்டத் தட்டமி ஞான்று
வெள்ளி வாரத் தொள்ளெரி யுண்ண
வுரைசான் மதுரையோ டரைசுகே டுறுமெனு
முரையு முண்டே.

Kaṭṭurai-Kādai, XXIII, ll. 133-7.

2 See K. G. Śaṅkara's article *Studies in Indian History, Q.J.M.S.,* October, 1920, esp. p. 72.

From these facts it is reasonable to assume that these two epics might possibly belong to the epoch of the Śaṅgam.

The Story as contained in the Epic: The Legends.—The story contained in the epic[1] is simple and is as follows. In Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam, the capital of the Cōḻas, there lived a wealthy merchant named Māśāttuvāṉ. He had a son Kōvalaṉ to whom was married a virtuous and devoted lady Kaṇṇaki by name, the daughter of Mānāikaṉ.[2] Being a wealthy young man Kōvalaṉ moved in high social circles and took an active interest in the amusements of the day. Once his eyes fell on a beautiful young dancing girl Mādavi by name, on whom he directed his love. He wasted all his wealth and money on this dancing girl and did not care for his devoted wife. When at last he had lost all his riches, he thought that Mādavi's love towards him had cooled and he became disgusted. Returning home he realized his past mistakes and resolved on a commercial career. The same night he left for Madura with his wife Kaṇṇaki. He had nothing to fall back upon except her jewels. She placed one of her costly jewels (*Śilambu*-anklet) ungrudgingly and willingly at his disposal. He took it to the market there to effect a sale. As misfortune would have it, he was

[1] The book is divided into three sections (Kāṇḍams) the *Puhār Kāṇḍam* of 10 chapters (Kādai, Sans. Gātha) the *Maduraikkāṇḍam* of 13 chapters and the *Vañjikkāṇḍam* of 7 chapters. It may be noted that Puhār, Madurai, and Vañji were three royal capitals at that time.

[2] The two terms *Mānāikaṉ* and *Māśāttuvāṉ*, though here used as proper names, are of great significance. They connote that the merchant class of the city which engaged its time and energy in maritime commercial ventures became known as *Mānāikaṉ* and that portion of the community which was busy in active trade by land by means of caravan became *Māśāttuvāṉ*. This is seen from the canto ii, ll. 7-8.

கலத்தினுங் காலினுந் தருவன ரீட்டக்
குலத்திற் குன்றாக் கொழுங்குடிச் செல்வர்

arrested as a thief of the royal jewels. The king without inquiring into the facts of the case impatiently ordered his execution. It was done. Poor Kaṇṇaki, when she came to know of this, became bewildered as it were. She went before the king and proved his innocence beyond the shadow of a doubt. The Pāṇḍyan King Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ realized his guilt and could not bear it. He fell down from his seat broken-hearted and died immediately. Still Kaṇṇaki could not control herself and in a fit of great anger cursed that the whole city be consumed by flames. And so it happened. Kaṇṇaki then proceeded westward to the Malaināḍu and continued to do penance at the foot of a *Vēṅgai* tree in the Neḍuvēḷkuṉṟam, a hill near Koḍuṅgōlūr (Cranganore) according to Aḍiyārkkunallār.

A Source of Information.—Barring the legendary portions the twin epics, the *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai* which can be likened in certain respects to the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* are the unfailing sources of information for writing out the history of the ancient Tamil land. The first is a contribution by a royal author and may be relied upon for details as regards the life in courts, and the accounts of the kings given. It is indeed a valuable mine of information for re-writing the history of the early Pāṇḍya, Cōḻa, and Cēra Kings. It shows the relation of the states with one another, not excluding North Indian states like Avanti and Magadha. It gives us a true picture of the social and religious life led by the people of those days. The various fine arts, such as music and dancing flourished on an extensive scale as literature itself did. It gives us also types of good and bad womanhood and the ruin of the innocent by the seduction of the latter. It shows how justice was ren-

dered, besides other details of administrative interest. These and several other things found mentioned are indeed valuable as throwing sufficient light on the history of the Tamils in the early centuries of the Christian era.

Sec. VI. SĀTTAṈĀR

The name Sīttalai Sāttaṉār.—One of the great epic writers belonging to the age of the so-called Third Saṅgam was Sāttaṉār. He was known also as Kūlavāṇikaṉ Sāttaṉār and Sīttalai Sāttaṉar in literature. Why he was called Kūlavāṇikaṉ may be due to the fact that he was himself a dealer in corn or that he was the son of a corn merchant in Madura. He was also known as Sīttalai Sāttaṉār. It must be remembered that it was a custom in that golden age of Tamil literature that every work should before its publication receive the seal of approval of the Saṅgam members among whom Sāttaṉār was a shining light. It is natural that some of these works contained errors in language besides mistaken ideas. Whenever such glaring defects met his eyes, it is said that he would resent it rather than find fault with the poor writer. But the mode of resenting seems to be peculiar and unbelievable. He used to strike himself on his head so often that it became full of sores and hence this epithet to his name. Whatever his hereditary profession and whatever his peculiar characteristics, it is undoubted that he was a 'master of logical subtleties and metaphysical cobwebs' as the late Mr. Kanakasabai has rightly remarked.[1] As regards Sīttalai again, Paṇḍit Swāminātha Ayyar has indicated an unmistakable reference of Maruttuvaṉ Dāmōdaraṉār in his appreciation of the *Tirukkuṟaḷ.*[2]

[1] *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago,* p. 207.
[2] வள்ளுவ முப்பாலாற் றலைக்குத்துத் தீர்வு சாத்தற்கு. St. 11 in the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai.*

The great physician Dāmōdaraṉār says as the smelling of a mixture of the juice of *cīndil,*[1] dried ginger, and honey would put an end to the crucial pain in the head, so the *muppāl,* constituting Dharma, Artha and Kāma of Vaḷḷuvar put an end to the prolonged suffering from which Śāttaṉār ailed. There is here warrant for the assumption that bad and faulty compositions always caused unbearable headache to the poet. That headache ceased with the composition of the *Kuṛaḷ.* Again Śīttalai like the modern Kuḷittalai may be the name of the village of Śāttaṉār, and only later ingenuity invented some plausible interpretation for the term.[2]

His Writings.—Leaving aside this question, it is abundantly clear that he was a native of Madura, and a corn dealer by profession before he made his mark in the distinguished Academy of the ancient Tamils. It is also clear that he won a position and rank equal to that of a poet-prince like Iḷaṅkō-aḍigaḷ. Śāttaṉār figures in the pages of the *Śilappadikāram* in more than one place and Iḷaṅkō always refers to him in terms of reverence and esteem.[3] And no doubt such an author must have been a powerful personality and wielded extraordinary influence. As a poet he seems to have been an accomplished writer. Simplicity of diction, easy flow of words, and a clear and perspicuous style, fecundity of thought, fineness of imagery, and richness of imagination, are the chief characteristics of his writings. Besides the classical work *Maṇimēkalai,* his contributions are to be found in the *Naṛṛiṇai* and other works comprised in the well-known collection of *Eṭṭuttogai.*

நில.

[2] Paṇḍit P. Nārāyaṇaswāmi Ayyar identifies this Śīttalai with Śittali in the Perambalūr Taluk, Trichy District. *Naṛṛiṇai,* p. 38.

[3] *தண்டமிழ் முதாசான்* Canto xxv, l. 66, see also l. 10 of the *Padikam.*

A source of information.—Since the discovery and publication of the *Maṇimēkalai* by the Mahāmahōpādhyāya, scholars have been at work on the subject. For, apart from its great literary value to students of Tamil literature, it is an invaluable source of information[1] to the historical student as it contains a wealth of details regarding the political, social and religious conditions and institutions prevalent about the beginning of the Christian era, when it is generally accepted this work was composed. That a mass of useful material lies buried in its pages is accepted even by acute critics.

The story—a continuation of that in the Śilappadikāram.—It would not be out of place here to give the story in broad outlines. The scheme as well as the plan are simple. These demonstrate fully that it is an offshoot or rather a continuation of the theme of the *Śilappadikāram.* Like the latter it also contains thirty Gāthas or cantos. But while the story of the *Śilappadikāram* is of such varied interest and is presented vividly like a dramatic representation, the story of the *Maṇimēkalai* is narrowed down to the aimless adventures of a Buddhist Bhikṣunī, sectarian in outlook.

The Legend.—The story is as follows:—When Mādavi the dancing girl, on whom Kōvalaṉ had bestowed his love, heard of her lover's execution in Madura, she became disgusted with the world and joined the Buddhist sect of monks and nuns to spend the evening of her life in prayer and meditation. It would appear that Mādavi had a daughter named Maṇimēkalai by Kōvalaṉ. This girl also had joined the nunnery under the influence of her

[1] A notable contribution on the subject is Dr. S. K. Ayyangar's *Maṇimēkalai, in its Historical Setting* (Luzac & Co., 1927).

mother assuming the role of a Buddhist nun. She used to go to the flower gardens to cull flowers therefrom. On one occasion it so chanced that the prince of the reigning king named Udayakumaraṉ saw her and became enamoured of her beauty. Struck by the shafts of Cupid, the prince pursued her, but in vain. She then went to Maṇipallavadvīpa where were enshrined the feet of the Buddha. Here she was told that the prince was her husband in a previous birth. Through the grace of the deity she got possession of a begging bowl which would be ever full and never empty.

She then returned to Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam and became fully engrossed in doing selfless social service. She supplied the thirsty and the hungry with drink and food assuming the disguise of one Kāyaśaṇḍikai. But Udayakumaraṉ, who was always on the look-out for her, came to know of this her new disguise, and was waiting for an opportunity to win her. One day the real Kāyaśaṇḍikai herself was seen in the garden and the prince ran after her. This was noticed by her husband, who in a fit of jealous fury murdered the prince. When Maṇimēkalai heard of this, she did not know what to do. She was really responsible for this mishap and she was conscious of her guilt. The king had her arrested and imprisoned but at the request of the queen, she was soon released. She then wandered throughout the land visiting several holy places. At last she settled at Kāñci performing penance and meditating on the righteous laws promulgated by the great preacher and teacher, the Buddha. The last years of her life were spent in that city.

Date.—The fact that the story is a continuation of that in the *Śilappadikāram* and the tradition that the authors of the twin epics were contemporaries lead us on

to assign to it the same epoch determined for the *Śilappadikāram*, namely, the second century A.D.[1] Among other arguments for the later date, two may be mentioned here. One is the occurrence of the term Kuccarakkuṭikai.[2] The Mahāmahōpādhyāya interprets it as a small temple built in Gūrjara style of architecture. On this a theory is built. The Gūrjaras seem to have entered India after A.D. 450 and hence the second century assigned becomes valueless.[3] But it is argued that the Gūrjaras belonged to the stock of the Śakas who settled in India before the break-up of the Mauryan empire.[4] What is more plausible is that the expression has nothing to do with the Gūrjaras but means a rock-cut shrine.[5]

The other argument is the fact of Maṇimēkalai going to the island of Śāvakam, identified with Sumatra and her interviews with the king of the land Puṇṇya Rāja and a preacher of the law (Dharma Śāvaka).[6] Fa Hien (399-414) A.D.[7] seems to have found not very much of Buddhism in the island, but I-tsing 671-95 A.D.[8] notices the wide prevalence of the Buddhist religion. From this it is argued that as the reference in the *Maṇimēkalai* shows advanced Buddhism in Sumatra, it is reasonable to place the work after the fourth century A.D.[9] Against this view it is advanced that though there was no dominance of Bud-

[1] Contra, *Jour of Or. Research,* Vol. ii, pts. iii-iv the article on the *Age of Maṇimēkalai,* wherein it is argued that it cannot be earlier than the sixth century A.D., pp. 220-22.

[2] குச்சரக்குடிகை (canto xviii, ll. 145 and 152).

[3] Macdonell *J.R.A.S.* (1919), p. 531.

[4] K. G. Śēṣa Ayyar *Q.J.M.S.*, vol, x, p. 186.

[5] *Contra,* M. S. Rāmaswāmi Ayyangar, *Studies in South Indian Jainism*, pp. 146-7.

[6] Cantos 24 and 25.

[7] *A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms* by James Legge, Oxford 1886, p. 113.

[8] *A Record of Bud. Religion* Tr. by J. Takakusu Intro. pp. xl-xli.

[9] *Contra* M. S. R. Ayyangar, *Studies in S. I. Jainism,* pp. 149-51.

dhism when Fa Hien visited the island, it cannot be denied that there was Buddhism. For the earlier form of Buddhism, it may be noted, was not very different from the Brahmanical religion, and hence an early foreign traveller of the type of Fa Hien could not differentiate the one from the other.

Buddhist Philosophy.—Apart from the story the chief importance of the book lies in its elaborate exposition of the philosophical doctrines of the Buddhist religion.[1] It is in this connection that the poem is invaluable. It proves the fact of the development of the Buddhist religion and its great power and influence during that period. The various tenets, sects, and principles thereof, as well as the chief places where the religion struck firm roots, and other such valuable items of information are extensively given especially in the latter portion of the work. The six systems of philosophy as found here are the Sāṅkhya, Nyāyā, Vaiśēṣika, Mīmāmsa, Lōkāyata, and Bauddha.[2] From such an elaborate, critical, and clear study of the Buddhist religion and philosophy it is natural to conclude that the great and celebrated author must have himself embraced the tenets of Buddhist doctrine. This means in other words that Śāttaṉār was a Buddhist by conviction. Otherwise he would not have given us such an exhaustive and appreciative study of the great religion. The

[1] A comparative study of the principles of the Buddhist logic in the *Maṇimēkalai* has convinced the learned Mahāmahōpādhyāya S. Kuppuswāmi Śāstri that they are based on ācārya Dinnāga's *Nyāyapravēśa* and on his other works. He would therefore assign the *Maṇimēkalai* to a period between Dinnāgā and Dharmakīrti *Jour. of Or. Research*, vol. i, pp. 191-201. See the introduction of Dr. S. K. Ayyangar to his work *Maṇimēkalai, In its Historical Setting.*

[2] There is another classification of six systems, Pūrva Mīmāmsa, Uttara Mīmāmsa (Vedānta), Sāṅkhya, Yōga, Nyāya and Vaiśēṣika. The latter account does not include the Lōkāyata and the Bauddha systems.

book extols the lofty maxims and principles that are the guiding factors of that religion. From this work we cannot but regard Śāttanār as a poet theologian of the first order.

As a Courtier.—At this time the Cēra king was Śeṅguṭṭuvan, a great patron of arts and letters, reigning in his great capital Karuvūr. It would appear that Śāttanār once visited his royal Court and was even a venerable courtier of the great Śeṅguṭṭuvan for a pretty long time. It was he who first gave the full details of the story of Kōvalan and Kaṇṇaki to the King and his brother the poet Iḷaṅkō-aḍigaḷ,[1] laying special emphasis on her greatness and on her chastity that was the invaluable ornament adorning both her physical and mental body. Moved by this soul-stirring account, Śeṅguṭṭuvan expressed a wish to perpetuate the glorious memory of that great lady and heroine. On the Queen's advice the erection of a temple and the installation of Kaṇṇaki therein as the deity was decided upon as the most fitting memorial and monument.[2] To this proposal the king readily gave his assent and soon the temple was built and was provided with all the necessary equipments. Iḷaṅkō thought fit to perpetuate her memory by means of a more imperishable memento and wrote the undying *Śilappadikāram.* Thus it is evident that Śāttanār was a contemporary of Śeṅguṭṭuvan and his brother Iḷaṅkō-Aḍigaḷ.

[1] See the *Padikam,* pp. 1-10 attached to the extant *Maṇimēkalai,* second *ed.,* 1921.

[2] Canto xxv, ll. 114-5.

CHAPTER III

SOME TAMIL MYSTIC POETS

Sec. I. INTRODUCTORY

We are in an age of growing materialism. The advancement of science with its rapid strides increases our sense pleasures and sense enjoyments, nay, creates a thirst for them even in the minds of the man in the street. Life is to many thinking students a riddle and a mystery. Life after death is still more a mystery. The quest after the highest reality which is the ultimate reality, and the effort to gain an experience of that reality is easily consigned to the realm of oblivion. This is philosophy and religion to which attention could be given only without prejudice to our mundane comforts. But it must not be confounded with philosophy. Philosophical speculation is the result of deep thinking which finds no place in mysticism. Mysticism is the result of a vast experience.[1] From this life of struggle and never-satisfied wants it is a relief to turn to the pages of our ancient literature, whether it be the classical Sanskrit or the vernaculars, and find how our ancients realized the philosophical quest after truth as far more important, and preferred it, as is illustrated by the story of Nacikētas, in the *Upaniṣads,* to a life of illusory and fleeting enjoyments.

In this line of development though India can claim more honours, yet she is not an exception. Parallel developments of mystic views and beliefs in the history of other countries of the world there have been, since the dawn of history. Nay every religion recognizes in

[1] See Preface, *Mysticism in Bhagavad Gita* by Māhēndranāth Sircār—

mysticism an elevating and awe-inspiring principle which would tackle problems of life more effectually and truly, than logical argumentations and scientific reasonings. But it is not all the same blind faith born of credulous belief. Just as India can speak of her own mystics, we have Islamic mystics and Christian mystics.[1] Everywhere there is a variety of types, each *bhakta* pursuing his individualistic method of attaining ecstatic communion with God.

Taking India, for example, every school of philosophy developed a type of mystic beliefs and views, so that we can speak of sacrificial mysticism, mysticism of the Upaniṣads, Yōga mysticism, Buddhistic mysticism, and devotional mysticism.[2]

With this preliminary explanation we may now proceed to examine the mystic views of some of the South Indian Tamil saints and *bhaktas*. At the outset it may be remarked that their mysticism can broadly be designated as devotional mysticism. In the story of the development of the mystic principle, the devotional type which is undoubtedly the latest one, seems to have been the special type we come across in the Tamil sages and saints.

Mysticism, then, is a state of religious feeling marked by supreme effort or efforts to attain direct communion with God. It is also the understanding of things divine by an unceasing process of deep spiritual insight and ripe spiritual experience. According to Goethe, 'it is the scholastic of the heart, the dialectic of the feelings'. And mystic poetry is that kind of literature which contains a sacred and also a secret meaning incomprehensible to the ordinary reader but well cognizable by

[1] See W.R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism.*

[2] In this classification I have followed Das Gupta's learned work, *Hindu Mysticism, London,* 1927.

the spiritually-minded persons. This may be material, namely, the matter it treats of is mystic, but the language may be clear, perspicuous and quite distinct. That means that it involves an altogether different meaning and significance realizable only by master minds. Or it may be formal. This kind deals not with the matter but with the manner. That is, the subject-matter is quite comprehensible but is couched in mystical language. Mystical also means 'allegorical'; but all allegory is not mystic. For there are allegories from which mystic interpretations are conspicuously absent. To this last category belong the works generally of all the eighteen *Siddhars*.

Sec. II. ŚAIVA MYSTICS

Judged by the above standards, Tamil literature contains yet unfathomable treasures of such wisdom and knowledge, born of great experience which are the melodious outbursts of highly spiritual souls in moments of supreme rapture. To this class belong, among others of which we shall speak in the sequel, the works of the four great teachers and preachers who go by the name of Śaiva Samayācāryas—Tirujñāna Sambandar, Apparsvāmigaḷ, Sundaramurtināyaṉār and Māṇikkavāśakar. The first three are the renowned authors of the collection of devotional songs and lyrics known as the *Tēvāram*. These four great ācāryas had full conviction and faith in their own religion. They began a preaching crusade against the disintegrating influence and the destructionist spirit of the rival religious sects. The *Samaṇas* or the Jains and the followers of the Buddha were the chief objects of their attack. They denounced their doctrines, and condemned their preachings in public. It was they who firmly planted the banner of their faith in Tamil land, if not, in the whole of South India.

TIRUJÑĀNA SAMBANDAR

We will now deal briefly about these mystic writers—the great authors of the *Tēvāram*. The *Tēvāram* is generally recognized as a text on mysticism though it occasionally lapses into newer elements and tendencies which cannot be characterized as mystical either in spirit or matter. Here a serious student comes across allegories of a higher order, viz., allegories which are mystical in character and extent. Tirujñāna Sambandar entitled Draviḍa Śiśu by Śaṅkarācārya occupies a prominent place among the distinguished Śaiva Samayācāryas.

The Legend.—The town of Śīyāḻi in Tanjore District is recorded by tradition as a *Noah's Ark*. When the whole world was submerged under a great deluge, this was the only spot which was not affected by the waters of the flood. Hence its well-known name Tōṇipuram (literally Boat city). Besides, other names are given to the same city. In this ancient town of Śīyāḻi was born Tirujñāna Sambandar. He was a Brahman by caste. When he was three years old, his father took him to the temple-tank, placed him on the bank and went for a bath. Perhaps feeling lonely the child cried 'mama', 'papa', when Lord Śiva and His Consort appeared before him and consoled him, Pārvatī giving him milk of wisdom. When his parent saw him thus drinking milk out of a golden bowl and questioned the child as to who gave it to him, the boy pointed to the distant temple, and sang in praise of the Lord.

Thenceforward he became a great and devout *bhakta*. It was the desire of the youngster to visit places sacred to the Lord Śiva. His father yielded to his wishes and took him from one place to the other always carrying him on his shoulder. As befits a *dvija*, his *upanayanam*

ceremony was performed. He then visited many a place of pilgrimage and established his reputation by miracles. In the course of his religious tour, he met Appar at Tiruvīḻimiḻalai near Māyavaram and helped to relieve the famine-stricken people there. Both Svāmijis then proceeded to Vēdāraṇyam where an invitation came to them from the Pāṇḍyan Queen and Minister to visit their capital Madura, especially as the king was under the influence of the *Śamaṇas*. Leaving Appar at Vēdāraṇyam, Sambandar repaired to Madura. With the connivance of the King, the *Śamaṇas* set fire to the residence of Sambandar with no effect. When this was brought to the notice of the Svāmiji, he cursed the Pāṇḍyan king to be attacked with burning fever. The *Śamaṇas* tried all their resources to effect a cure, but with no success. At last the king prayed to Sambandar to relieve him of his fell disease, which he immediately did. Then an assembly of both *Śaivas* and *Śamaṇas* was convened to establish the superiority of either sect. After a number of tests in which the *Śamaṇas* had an inglorious defeat, Śaivism was accepted as the true religion by the king. After this, Sambandar set out on pilgrimage and visited many places preaching and singing and working miracles until he came back to his native home. There he responded to the wishes of his father and consented to get himself married in the old Vēdic style. But at the very early age of sixteen the revered Svāmiji became one with the Holy of Holies. This ācārya is generally taken to have flourished in the first half of the seventh century. To the same period belongs Appar Svāmigaḷ who was a contemporary of Sambandar. While the latter's collection of hymns forms the first three Holy books (Tirumuṟai), Appar's are the next three Holy books

of the *Tēvāram.*[1] The compiler of the *Tēvāram* is Nambi Āṇḍār Nambi.[2]

His Mysticism.—Sambandar praises the little town of Tōṇipuram by twelve different names. For every name he sings one stanza, each one of these stanzas consisting of the same lines repeated four times. The ordinary reader who sees only the surface is apt to think that this repetition is but for the sake of greater emphasis and nothing more. But it should be understood that the whole thing is pitched in a high key and the repetition has a mystic force and hidden meaning and produces a wonderfully powerful effect.[3]

The four lines of each stanza which admit of different interpretations would not produce the intended effect,[4] namely, to bring out the full force and significance, if rendered in any other medium than the ancient Tamil language, and hence would not be of much interest to the common reader. Under these circumstances we refrain from any elaborate exposition of these stanzas. But it may be noted here that the language is mystic or as

[1] For fuller details, see *Periya Purāṇam* of Śēkkiḻār, *Tirugñāna Sambandamurti Nāyaṉār Purāṇam.*

[2] For a critical study of Nambi Āṇḍār Nambi, see Sōmasundara Dēśikar's *Saivaśikāmaṇikaḷ Iruvar* (1930).

[3] பிரம புரத்துறை பெம்மா னெம்மான்
பிரம புரத்துறை பெம்மா னெம்மான்
பிரம புரத்துறை பெம்மா னெம்மான்
பிரம புரத்துறை பெம்மா னெம்மான்.
Tirumuṟai I. Padikam 127, p. 266.

[4] கழுமல முதுபதிக் கவுணியன் கட்டுரை
கழுமல முதுபதிக் கவுணியன் கட்டுரை
கழுமல முதுபதிக் கவுணியன் கட்டுரை
கழுமல முதுபதிக் கவுணியன் கட்டுரை.
Ibid., p. 267.

The *Tēvāram*, ed. by K. Sadāśiva Chettiar and published by the S. I. Saiva Siddhānta Works Publishing Society, Madras, 1927.

stated at the outset, mysticism here is of the formal kind.

Date of Sambandar.—After ably refuting the hypothesis of Dr. Caldwell[1] and of Nelson[2] as to the age of Sambandar, the late P. Sundaram Pillai proves that the saint must have lived before the celebrated Śaṅkarācārya and concludes that Sambandar could not have lived in any period later than the early years of the seventh century after Christ.[3] That Sambandar is a contemporary of Appar and Śiṛuttoṇḍar, otherwise known as Parañjōtiyar, is evident from the legend in the *Periyapurāṇam*. We know Parañjōtiyar was the Commander-in-chief of the Pallava King Narasimha Varman I who distinguished himself against the Chālukyas.[4] According to inscriptional evidence, Narasimhavarman I succeeded Māhēndravarman I in A.D. 630 and continued his rule to A.D. 660.[5] Thus the age of Sambandar must be looked for sometime in the middle of the seventh century A.D.

APPAR SVĀMIGAḶ

The Legend.—Contemporary with Sambandar, and Vēḷāḷa by caste, Appar was born in the village of Tiruvāmūr near Panruṭṭi Railway Station. He had a sister by name Tilakavati. When young it was resolved to get her married to the commander of the chieftain

[1] *Comparative Dravidian Grammar,* Intro., pp. 137-43.
[2] *District Manual,* pt. iii, pp. 54-70.
[3] See his article 'Some Milestones in the History of Tamil Literature' or 'The Age of Tirugñānasambandar,' *Tamilian Ant. Society* Series No. 3.
[4] See *Śiṛuttoṇḍar Purāṇam* (*Periyapurāṇam*), esp. st. 6.
[5] *Ep. Ind.,* vol. vi, p. 11; *S. I. I.,* vol. i, p. 152. See also R, Gōpālan's *Pallavas of Kāñchi,* p. 97 and f; K. A. Nīlakaṇṭa Śāstri—The *Paṇḍyan Kingdom,* pp. 53-4.

Contra K. S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri *Saiva Samayācaryas,* p. 59: Mr. Sāstriar assigns middle of the sixth century A.D. Cf. K. R. Subrahmanian, *Origin of Saivism,* pp. 64-8.

Pallavarāya. Unfortunately before marriage the valiant commander died heroically in the field of action. The parents of Tilakavati also had in the meantime died and Tilakavati resolved to lead a life of celibacy and be of help to her brother, the future Appar Svāmiji. Meanwhile Appar got into contact with the *Śamaṇas* of the place and became a convert to their faith. This pained his sister very much. She prayed night and day to Lord Śiva that her brother might be brought back from the *Śamaṇa* fold. The prayer was heard and the Lord struck Appar with a fell disease which was found incurable by the *Śamaṇas* who left him helpless. Then he thought of his sister and betook himself to his residence. She prayed to the Lord to relieve him of his pain. Soon he was himself. Unshakable faith in Śaivism re-dawned in his mind. This greatly put out the *Śamaṇas,* who reported to their king at Pāṭalipuram how Appar had cheated them and left their camp unknowingly. The king sent for him and subjected him to all sorts of cruel tortures, feeding him with poison, slaking him in a lime kiln, placing him before a mad elephant, and throwing him into the sea. But out of all of these he emerged unscathed. The king became surprised and found out the truth of the Śaiva faith. He himself became a convert. Appar carried the message of his faith throughout the Tamil Nāḍu, cultivated Sambandar's acquaintance, and carried on the propagandist work sometimes in collaboration with him and sometimes single-handed. Thus he visited many places of pilgrimage, built several outhouses, *maṭhas,* then and there, and at last attained his salvation in the village of Pūmpukalūr about four miles to the east of Naṉṉilam Railway Station.[1]

[1] See *Tirunāvukkuarasunāyaṉār Purāṇam* (*Periya-Purāṇam*).

The Miracle of reviving to life Appūdiyaḍikaḷ's dead son.—Appar was so widey known and so much revered that a certain Brahman Appūdiyaḍikaḷ by name, in the village of Tiṅgaḷūr in Tanjore District, who had never seen him nor known him personally, named his sons, daughters, servants, and even the animals which he reared, after this well-known saint Tirunāvukkaraśu, which literally means 'supreme in speech'.

It happened that Apparsvāmi came to Tiṅgaḷūr in the course of his religious tour. He inquired where he could get hospitality. This Brahman's name was mentioned and he went to his house. As he was clothed in the garb of a Sannyāsin and as it is one of the duties enjoined on the Hindu householders to entertain such ascetics in a spirit of utmost reverence and worship, Appūdi welcomed with great pleasure the Svāmi who, it must be noted, was not a Brahman. All his sons, daughters, servants and even the domestic animals were introduced to him one by one as Tirunāvukkaraśu Nos. I, II and III and so on. The Svāmi was so struck at this that he asked the Brahman why he had named them thus. He answered that it was out of love and reverence to the great Appar Samayācārya who had done and suffered so much for Śaivism little knowing that the Sannyāsin standing before him was no other than the revered Svāmiji himself. When the latter mentioned that he was the personage whom he had thus revered and loved, his eyes were filled with rapturous and joyous tears, for he could not contain himself. A dinner in his honour was soon arranged.

Meanwhile his eldest son who had gone to fetch some plantain leaves from the backyard was bitten by a big cobra and died of blood-poison instantaneously. Having kept the dead body hidden in a corner, the Brahman did

not inform the Svāmi of this lest he should decline to dine on account of the pollution in the house. All the arrangements over, leaves were spread and the Svāmi was served. The Svāmi expressed a wish that all his children should dine with him. All the Tirunāvukkaraśus excepting No. 1 came. The Svāmi missing the eldest enquired after him. The man could no more hide. He dared not speak an untruth before the great saint. So he gave out what had happened. The body was brought at his command before him and the Svāmi burst into melodious prayers to the Lord Śiva in ten successive verses, the first giving the one element of His body limbs and ornaments, the second the two of His, the third the three of His and so on, until the tenth describing the ten elements. To the inexplicable wonderment of the poor Brahman and his family, the boy showed signs of life returning to him. He soon opened his eyes, sat up and was quite alive. This incident is found in the *Tēvāram* in the *Viṣaṁtīrta Padikam.*[1]

Mystic Interpretation.—The mystical interpretation that is usually given is that there are ten stages by which the poison gets ultimately into the head, and only slowly and by degrees could this poison be removed from the system. For every stage one stanza was sung and the peculiar kind of chanting added a mysterious and magnetic force with the consequence that the effects of the poison were removed and the boy was revived. This is still considered a powerful *mantra* for healing the poisonous bite of the serpent.

Date of Appar.—Appar was a contemporary of Tirujñāna Sambandar. That he flourished in the first half of the seventh century A.D. is evident from the fact that he

[1] Tirumuṟai IV, Padikam 18, p. 41, *Tēvāram* (Tirumuṟai 4 to 6), ed. by K. Sadāśiva Chettiar, Śaiva Siddhānta Works (1928).

was a contemporary of Guṇabhara, known to history as Māhēndravarman I who ruled from A.D. 600 to 630.[1] According to K. S. Srīnivāsa Pillai, the probable date of his conversion to the Śaiva faith from the Jaina may be before A.D. 613-4.[2] Perhaps Appar belonged to the latter half of the sixth century and continued to the seventh century.[3]

SUNDARAMŪRTI SVĀMIGAḶ

The Legend.—In the village of Tirunāvalūr, now known as Tirunāmanallūr, about eleven miles west of Panruṭṭi Railway Station, was born the saint Sundaramūrti. He belonged to the Brahman caste. The chieftain of that place, who was Narasiṅga Muṉaiyar, took a fancy to the child and brought him up in his place with the permission of his parents. When he became of marriageable age, the father Śaḍaiya ṉār selected for him the daughter of one Śaḍaṅkavi Śivācāri of Puttūr. The wedding day came on and the ceremonies were proceeding, when the Lord Śiva appeared in an old man's guise and laid a ban on the marriage as he claimed that Sundara was his bond slave and as such could not marry without his previous permission, according to the bond executed by the boy's grandfather, and that he therefore objected to the marriage. The bond was denied, and the boy in a fit of rage seized it and tore it to pieces. The old man insisted on his claim and they all repaired to the assembly of the learned men of Nallūr to have the matter properly adjudicated. The members were satisfied with the veracity of the bond, and adjudged Sundara as a hereditary bondsman to the old man.

[1] See the *Pallavas of Kāñchi*, p. 88.
[2] *Tamiḻ Varalāṟu*, vol. ii, p. 63.
[3] See K. S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri, *Śaiva Samayācāryas*, p. 47.

Sundara went along with the old man who entered the temple and suddenly disappeared proving to all that he was no other than the Lord enshrined in the temple.

Our Svāmiji's joy knew no bounds. From that day he became an ardent devotee of the Śiva cult and wandered from place to place. In the course of his tour he came to Tiruvārūr temple where he met Paravaiyār, a virgin devotee of the Lord, and took her to wife and lived happily with her. Then he went on to a number of other places sacred to Śiva, working miracles here and there. One such place was Tiruvoṟṟiyūr, north of Madras, where he met another female devotee Śaṅgiliyār, whom also he married after promising to live with her for a fixed period. But as he forsook her before this period, he lost the sight of his eyes which, however, he regained through the grace of God.

Sundara became a friend of the Cēra king—Cēramāṉ Perumāḷ Nāyaṉār, who invited him to his place and duly honoured him. While he was in his capital Mahōdai, otherwise known as Koḍuṅkōḷūr (modern Cranganore), the term of his stay in this world was ended; and he began to proceed to Kailāsa, there to join the Lord and abide with Him for ever. This was noticed by Cēramāṉ who also prayed to follow him and was permitted. His hymns form the seventh *Tirumuṟai* of the *Tēvāram*. The age at which he attained salvation is said to be thirty-two.[1]

The date of Sundaramūrti.—According to the tradition transmitted by the *Periyapurāṇam*, Sundaramūrti was a contemporary of Cēramāṉ Perumāḷ. Again the legend contained in the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal*

[1] See for full particulars: *Periyapurāṇam, Taduttāṭkoṇḍa Purāṇam* and *also Eyarkōṉ Kalikkāmanāyaṉār Purāṇam* and *Veḷḷānaiccarukkam*

of Parañjōtimuṉivar bears out that the Pāṇḍyan king who reigned during that time was Varaguṇa. But the difficulty arises from the fact that there are two kings by that name.[1] The king Varaguṇa whose name occurs in the Aivarmalai record must have ascended the throne in A.D. 862-3, and must have been the grandson of Varaguṇa Mahārāja.[2] According to Mr. Śrīnivāsa Pillai, Sundaramūrti died in A.D. 825 which is also reckoned to be the last year of the rule of Cēramāṉ Perumāḷ.[3] If this assumption is correct, Sundaramūrti must have been a contemporary of Varaguṇa Mahārāja. According to Professor Jouveau-Dubreuil[4] the Pāṇḍyan king Varaguṇa Mahārāja led an invasion into the Pallava kingdom in the reign of Dantivarman. Dantivarman's rule seems to have extended to fifty-one years, commencing roughly at 775 A.D. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that Sundaramūrti lived in the latter half of the eighth century and the first quarter of the ninth century. According to M. Rāghava Ayyangar, Sundaramūrti was a contemporary of Rājasimha Pallava and hence must have flourished in the first quarter of the eighth century.[5] But if we accept the view that Cēramāṉ Perumāḷ was the royal patron of the saint, and that his death marks the beginning of the *Kollam* era,—the *Kollam* era began on the 15th August, A.D. 825,—Sundara must be said to belong to the beginning of the ninth century A.D.[6]

[1] See for the genealogy and identification, the *Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, p. 41 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 45.
[3] *Tamiḻ Varalāṟu* II, pp. 72-3.
[4] The *Pallavas*, p. 77.
[5] See *note* on pp. 135-6 of *Āḻvārkaḷkālanilai*.
[6] *Śaivasamayācāryas*, p. 75. See also K. R. Subrahmanian, *Origin of Śaivism*, pp. 68-9.

MĀṆIKKAVĀŚAKAR

The Date.—The life of this South Indian saint who bears a favourable comparison with St. Augustine, St. Paul, and St. Francis of Assisi and other learned saints of the West, is to be traced from poetical legends which have grown around that notable figure. It is even difficult to definitely assign to him a particular period, but still it is reasonable to fix it as the ninth century A.D. Lassen's theory of the sixth century and Pope's theory of the seventh or eighth century are not supported by authentic evidences. Prof. K.A. Nīlakaṇṭa Śāstri is of opinion that the Varaguṇa mentioned by the Saint is neither of the two Varaguṇas known to history but a Varaguṇa of legend about whom we are yet to know anything and he concludes that Māṇikkavāśakar must have preceded the Tēvāram Trio.[1] K. S. Śrīnivāsa Pillai[2] and S. Anavaratavināyakam Pillai arrive at the conclusion that he lived after the Tēvāram Trio. K. G. Śēṣa Ayyar discusses at length this problem and fixes the age in the latter half of the fourth century. It is contended that by the term *Poy-aḍimai-illāta-pulavar* Sundara refers to Māṇikkavāśakar. Again the reference by Appar to the legend of purchasing horses for royal use and their transformation to jackals is adduced.[3] Against this it is pointed out that there are unmistakable references to Sambandar[4] and Sundaramūrti[5] in the *Tiruvāśakam.*

1 *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, pp. 66-7.

2 *Tamiḻ Varalāṟu*, vol, ii, pp. 77-125, *Tamiḻ Perumakkaḷ Varalāṟu*, p. 74 ff.

3 See the *Tamilian Antiquary*. See in the same journal T. Ponnambalam Pillai's article 'Māṇikkavāśakar and Christians of Malabar.'

4 கழுமல மதனிற் காட்சிகொடுத்தும்.

5 தேனமர் சோலைத் திருவாரூரின்
ஞானந் தன்னை நல்கிய நன்மையும்.

Also see K. S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri's *Śaiva Samayāchāryas*, pp. 12-27. His conclusion is that the saint belonged to the fourth or fifth century A.D. (Vasanta Book Depot, Madras), 1927.

The Legend.—During the epoch when King Arimarttanaṉ was ruling at Madura, Māṇikkavāśakar was born in a place called Tiruvādavūr. He was a Brahman by caste and grew up to be a promising young man of parts. The king appointed him as his minister. A devout student of the *Āgamas,* this young minister was in quest of a teacher who would initiate him into the mysteries of the *Āgama* literature.

Once it happened thus. The king, whose cavalry arm was deficient, was told of horses landed for sale at his port town by a merchant from Arabia, and he deputed his minister to buy them for him. On the way he met a Śaiva saint, the Lord Śiva himself with his attendants, and became a convert to His Grace and remained there as His disciple, spending all the king's money in building a temple there. On hearing this, the king ordered him to return to the court immediately. He returned accordingly, permitted by the Lord who promised to send the horses on a fixed date. The minister was suspected of embezzlement and imprisoned. The Lord converted the jackals of the forest into horses and drove them before His Majesty. He became well pleased and also satisfied, and released the minister from bondage.

But at night the horses all turned into jackals and ran away. This highly enraged the king who inflicted on his minister further tortures and punishment. But soon coming to know of his real innocence and true devotion, the king repented and reinstated Māṇikkavāśakar in his place and thenceforward held him in high respect. But the sweets of office had no longer any charm for our saint and his longing for the Sacred Presence deepened. He took a pilgrimage to Cidambaram, and by a miracle

vanquished the Buddhists, and soon became one with the Lord.[1] From this it would appear that this sage lived in an age of decaying Buddhism and rising Śaivism.

His chief works are the *Tiruvāśakam* and the *Tirukkōvai*.[2] Of these the *Tiruvāśakam* seems to tell an autobiographical tale of the different stages of his spiritual life and experience which ultimately enabled him to attain enjoyment ineffable and eternal. It is a torrential outflow of ardent religious feelings and emotions in rapturous songs and melodies. This work may be regarded as a convenient handbook on mystical theology. It is the spontaneous outpouring of his ecstatic feelings, under the stress of strenuous spiritual impulses. Among the accredited devotional works in the Tamil tongue it takes the foremost rank. The other equally remarkable work of his is the *Tirukkōvai*. Superficial readers devoid of true spiritual acumen are apt to treat this supreme mystic work as an ordinary text of love-poetry. True, what is known in Sanskrit as the *Śṛṅgārarasa* seems at first sight to dominate the whole poem. But it must be remembered that it is only a thin veil covering grand and beautiful religious truths and conceptions.

It would not be out of place here to give the sum and substance of the story contained in this poem as a layman finds it. A lover accidentally meets a maid in some solitary mountain glade, is enamoured of her, approaches her and both become fast attached to each other by the silken bonds of love. Then they marry in public and settle down to the life of householders.

[1] Vide *Tiruvādavūradigaḷ Purāṇa...*, by Kaḍavuḷ-Māmuṉivar, Jaffna ed. (1897). See also Introduction of G. U. Pope's edition of the *Tiruvāśakam*, pp. xvii-xxxii.

[2] Published by Śendilvēlu Mudaliar, Madras.

Shortly after, one business or other necessitates the husband's absence in foreign countries for a shorter or longer period according to the nature of the business. Both feel the separation keenly, and look forward rather eagerly to the day when both of them should meet for an indissoluble union as it were. But the grief of the forlorn wife in her solitary home ever thinking of her absent lord, daily becomes more and more unbearable, and she breaks forth in piteous wail, expressive of the various phases of her grief. It is this grief of the lonely wife yearning to join her husband in warm, indissoluble embrace that allegorizes the earnest efforts of the individual soul seeking re-union with the Universal Soul.

Such a simple theme as this need not require a Māṇikkavāśakar to expound and illustrate it. So there is an altogether different interpretation that should be read into this supreme work. The story goes that this gifted Ācārya, during his pilgrimage from one place to another, came to Cidambaram, one of the holy places of Southern India, stood before the shrine of the Lord Naṭarāja, and sang these verses. And the Lord, it is said, himself took them down in his own hand to show his appreciation of this poem and the deep devotion by which it was inspired.

Men of deep intuitive insight perceive and perceive rightly, the highly spiritual meaning underlying this story. The Lord was the eternal object of his love, and Māṇikkavāśakar himself, a lover from the earliest days of his life. But by some accident, he has been long separated from the object of his love. He feels this separation intensely, realizes this well, and yearns for an indissoluble, inviolable, and irreproachable union or oneness with God.[1] The usual practice with other mystic poets is just the

[1] See *Tirukkōvaiyār Uṇmai*, ed. by Swāminātha Paṇḍitar.

opposite. In other words, the Lord is generally invoked as lover and the devotee as the object of love.

The opening stanza[1] of this valuable work, entitled *nūrciṟappu,* apparently written by an ardent admirer of this great saint, which I cannot help quoting, furnishes a gist in four lines of the various aspects in which persons of different kinds of temperaments would view it.

'When speaking of this, the Brahmans will say this is the essence of the Vēdas: the Yōgins, that of the Āgamas: libidinous persons, that it is a treatise on erotics: the logicians, a work on dialectics, etc.' Thus, the *Tirukkōvai* will be found to be a splendid example of the purely material kind of mystic poetry.

Sec. III. THE VAIṢṆAVA SAMAYĀCĀRYAS

Before we proceed to speak of the later and the more recent mystic poets, it is necessary to state the great part played by the eminent Vaiṣṇava Samayācāryas. These were equally distinguished and renowned teachers and preachers of the Vaiṣṇava cult. Some of them were even contemporaries of the Śaiva Samayācāryas. These Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas and saints go by the name of Āḻvārs, and they are twelve in number. They were the famous authors of the great and well-known collection of the *Nālāyirappirabandam* or *Divyappirabandam.* This, it may be said without any fear of contradiction, stands on the same footing of sanctity as the *Tēvāram* of the Śaiva saints, to which

[1] *ஆரணங்கா ணென்ப ரந்தணர் யோகிய ராகமத்தின்*
காரணங்கா ணென்பர் காமுகர் காமநன் னூலதென்ப
ரேரணங்கா ணென்ப ரெண்ண ரெழுத்தென்ப ரின்புலவோர்
சீரணங்காய சிற்றம் பலக்கோவையைச் செப்பிடினே.
Ed. by Āṟumuga Nāvalar (fourth edition).

we had occasion to refer. These Āḻvārs were also religious mystics of the same type. Every one of them had personal, intuitive experience of the Divine Presence. They also preached in season and out of season against the doctrines and the practices of the *Śamaṇas* as well as the Buddhists, who were regarded as the common enemies of the Hindu religion. Among these high spiritual souls, Nammāḻvār, Kulaśēkarāḻvār, Tirumaṅgaiyāḻvār and Āṇḍāḷ figure prominently. This work would not be complete without at least a brief reference to each of these four, if not to all the twelve.

1. NAMMĀḺVĀR

The Legend.—The greatest of all Āḻvārs and a born saint was Nammāḻvār.[1] He is known by different appellations which show his universal popularity. He is popularly known as Śaṭakōpaṉ and Māṟan. According to orthodox Vaiṣṇava tradition, unlike other Āḻvārs who were incarnations of Viṣṇu's weapons or ornaments, Nammāḻvār was the *avatār* of Viṣvaksēna, or Gaṇanātha, the head of the Gaṇas of God Viṣṇu. Nammāḻvār was the son of Kāri, who held a high post under the Pāṇḍyan king and afterwards became a petty chieftain known as Kāriyār of Vaḻutivaḷanāḍu, tributary to the Pāṇḍyas. Its chief place was Tirunagari on the Tāmbraparṇi in the Tinnevelly District. Mythology clouds the life of the saint from his childhood. The child was born, but did not exhibit signs of hunger or thirst for ten days, to the despair of the parents. On the eleventh day the baby was left under a tamarind tree in the local temple. From that time the baby entered into Yōgic contemplation up to

[1] See the *Guruparamparai* both *Teṅgalai* and *Vaḍagalai* versions: See also A. Govindācārya's *The Holy Lives of Āḻvārs* or *Draviḍa Saints*, p. 191 ff., Mysore, 1902.

his sixteenth year. About this time another Āḻvār, Madurakavi, a Brahman of Tirukkōḷūr, who had dedicated his life early to the service of God, heard of the illustrious Nammāḻvār and became his disciple. At this stage the Lord Nārāyaṇa appeared and initiated Nammāḻvār into the mystery of the great *mantra*—ŌM NAMŌ NĀRĀYAṆĀYA. This was the *summum bonum* of his life. He became a great teacher and included among his disciples, Madurakavi, the author of *Kaṇṇinuṇśiṟuttāmbu*. It is generally believed that this saint lived thirty-five years and his inspired utterances, the *Tiruviruttam*, the *Tiruvāśiriyam, Periya Tiruvandādi* and *Tiruvāymoḻi,* correspond to the four Vedas, the Rik, Yajus, Atharva and Sāma. Those who follow the Vaiṣṇava cult look upon his intensely religious works as containing the very pith and marrow of the sacred Vedas. Of these the *Tiruvāymoḻi* which contains a thousand poems and which forms nearly one-fourth of the *Divyappirabandam,* deals in an excellent and masterly way with the various and varied aspects and attributes of the Lord Nārāyaṇa. The *Tiruvāymoḻi* and especially *Tiruviṟuttam* deal with ecstatic love of the Lord. The God is represented as Nāyaka (Lover) and himself Nāyaki or the object of love. Nammāḻvār thus holds an honoured place in the history of Vaiṣṇavism in South India.

Date.—As has been said already, he is the great Ācārya who yearned for the living presence of Lord Viṣṇu and succeeded in realizing that sacred and holy Presence. An examination of the Āṉamalai inscriptions[1] has led the late Gōpinātha Rao to the conclusion that Nammāḻvār lived in the first half of the ninth century.[2]

[1] See *Sen Tamiḻ* for 1906, Gopinātha Rao's articles; also his *History of the Srī Vaiṣṇavas*, Madras University, 1923, pp. 18-21.

[2] See for a fuller discussion on the subject *Early History of Vaiṣṇavism*, p. 42 ff.

There are two other opinions with regard to the date of Nammāḻvār. One is that he belongs to the fifth century A.D., and the other to the tenth or eleventh century A.D. Arguments in favour of both these theories are examined by Śrīnivāsa Pillai, but it is not possible to arrive at a definite conclusion.[1] From the surnames Māṟaṉ and Parāṅkuśaṉ, and from the fact that he was the predecessor of Tirumangaiāḻvār, according to the *Guru-paramparai*, he may be placed in the reign of king Māṟaṉ, great grandfather of Parāntaka Neḍunjaḍaiyaṉ of Vēḷvi-kudi grant, roughly in the latter half of the seventh century.

2. KULAŚĒKARA ĀḺVĀR

The Legend.—Kulaśēkara[2] is another of these deeply religious mystics. His transports of religious emotion are, as we shall presently see, peculiarly his own. It is said that Kulaśēkara was born as the incarnation of Viṣṇu's *Kaustubha*. He was the son of Dṛḍhavrata, king of Kērala. Before he was sixteen he learnt the *trayi*, the *purāṇas, the itihāsas* and other allied literature. After his marriage Dṛḍhavrata had Kulaśēkara crowned king and retired to the forest to lead the life of a Vānaprasta. Kulaśēkara as a king discharged his duties by protection and extensive conquests in the Cōḻa and Pāṇḍyan kingdoms. Like the illustrious Aśoka of ancient days, Kulaśēkara utilized his position to do moral and religious propaganda.

Date.—This Vaiṣṇavācārya is, according to tradition, the next after Nammāḻvār in point of time. It is said that he must have lived before the ninth century, before Vijayālayaṉ, the Cōḻa king, who made Tanjore his capital

[1] *Tamiḻ Varalāṟu* II, pp. 148-72.
[2] *Draviḍa Saints*, p. 117.
Divyaśūri Caritram, pp. 33-6.

in A.D. 849. There is no reason to assign to him the eleventh or twelfth century A.D.[1] Other evidences point out that he must have flourished at the commencement of the eighth century.[2]

His Mysticism.—He lived in a world of his own creation. The one outstanding feature in him was that he retired into himself from the world without. It would appear that his soul lived apart from his surroundings and environments. The fourth *daśakam* of his songs designated *Perumāḷ Tirumoḻi* and addressed to Śri Tiruvēṅkaṭa, Lord of the Tirupati hills, beginning with the word *ūṉēṟu*.[3] A perusal of his writings makes these things evident, nay quite obvious. Kulaśēkara, it must be noted at the outset, was one of the distinguished Cēra kings. He was a Paṇḍita Cēra. Himself a great scholar and author, he was a devoted patron of learning and learned men. He was an ardent devotee of Śri Rāmacandra. The tenth *daśakam*[4] is addressed to God Viṣṇu of Tillainagar Tiruccitrakūṭam (Cidambaram).

It is a peculiar custom in India that it is not enough if one goes through the religious works, but one should discipline oneself before this by hearing the story from a *guru* or from one versed in that particular branch of study.

Kulaśēkara was a great believer in the observance of such customs and traditions. So he used to hear the

[1] See also M. Rāghava Ayyangar's *Āḻvārkaḷ Kālanilai*, pp. 177-200.

[2] S. K. Ayyangar's *Early History of Vaiṣṇavism*, pp. 26-37.

[3] ஊனேறு செல்வத்து உடற்பிறவி யான்வேண்டேன்
ஆனேறேழ் வென்றான் அடிமைத் திறமல்லால்
கூனேறு சங்கமிடத் தான்தன் வேங்கடத்துக்
கோனேரி வாழும் குருகாய்ப் பிறப்பேனே. p. 151

[4] அங்கணெடு மதில்புடைசூழ் அயோத்தி யென்னும்
அணிநகரத்து உலகனைத்தும் விளங்கும் சோதி.

P. 165 *Nāḷāyira Divyappirabandam*, edited by D. Kriṣṇamācāri, Madras, third edition.

story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. When he was engaged in hearing the story,[1] and reached the portion known as the *kharavadha,* where Śri Rāma fought single-handed against myriads of Rākṣasās, he could not contain himself. He burst out, put on the armour, and went forth to the help of Śri Rāmacandra. Again when hearing the narration of Rāma's army crossing to Laṅkā, he armed himself and got down into the sea with his retinue of soldiers thinking of rendering assistance to the great Daśaratha's son.

These two incidents in his life are referred to here, to indicate how Kulaśēkara was moved by intense and deep religious faith in the object of his love and devotion who was Śri Rāmacandra himself. Thus, mysticism to him is conscious, something real, and a living presence.

This intense religious life on the part of the king did not appeal to his ministers. The latter resolved to get rid of the Vaiṣṇava devotees who were hangers-on of the king by fair or foul means. After many an attempt, they removed a costly jewel from the image of his tutelary deity and attributed the theft to these devotees. The royal saint pleaded their innocence by offering to put his hand into a pot containing cobras. If the cobras did not bite, it was a monumental proof of the innocence of the devotees and the criminal offence of his ministers. The cobras refused to harm the noble soul. The ministers realized his sincerity and greatness and conducted themselves rightly thenceforward. Still the charm of the throne did not weigh with him. He had his son crowned, and retired to lead a life of penance and prayer. He made an extensive pilgrimage from Śrīraṅgam to Tirupati until at last he reached Maṉṉārkōyil in Tinnevelly District where his soul departed from his body. It is said that he was then about seventy-five years old.

[1] See the *Guruparamparais.*

His other work which is in Sanskrit, is the well-known *Mukundamālā*. Here is a picture of the grief-stricken king exhibiting his keen longing for re-union with Him, thus justifying our conception in regard to his mysticism.[1]

3. TIRUMAṄGAI ĀḺVĀR

The Legend.[2]—In Tiruvāli Tirunagari near the modern Śīyāḻi was born Tirumaṅgai maṉṉaṉ. He is considered as the incarnation of Viṣṇu's *śāraṅga*. When young he was known as Nīla. His father belonged by caste to the fourth class and he held the office of a General in the Cōḻa army. The young Nīla was trained in military science, and he became in time a soldier of much reputation. The Cōḻa king was pleased with his valour and made him the head of Tiruvāli-nāḍu. In this capacity again he won a name and got recognition by the title of Parakāla, literally death to the enemies. Tirumaṅgai entered into the life of the householder by marrying a pious lady named Kumudavalli, a staunch devotee of Nārāyaṇa. Through her unparalleled influence, Tirumaṅgai became a convert to Vaiṣṇava faith and spent all his income on charities. Failure to pay tribute to the Cōḻa king enraged the latter who had him punished by imprisonment. Then it is said that the Lord enshrined at Kañcīvaram offered to pay the dues and got him freed. So it happened. He was always in need of money to be spent on charities. Expediency dictated to him to resort to unscrupulous ways to satisfy his religious thirst. Hence he took to the life of a highway robber. The Lord who was pleased with his sincerity appeared before him in the guise of a Brahman, when he robbed him of all his possessions. The Lord imparted

[1] *Tr. Ar. S.*, vol. v, 109-11. [2] *Divyasūricaritam*, pp. 57-63.

to him *aṣṭākṣara mantra* and disappeared. This threw the pious robber into a transport of real joy. This invested him with all the qualifications of a good poet.

In the course of his pilgrimage to the important Vaiṣṇava shrines he reached Śrīraṅgam where he resolved to improve the building of the temple. But he was short of money. The blind zeal drove him to think of stealing the Buddhist golden image at Negapatam. With this idea he reached Negapatam, effected an entry into the temple with great difficulty, got the image and returned to Śrīraṅgam through the modern villages of Puravaccēri and Tirukkaṇṇaṅguḍi. The Buddhist idol was melted and the expenses were met. Once again he set out on a pilgrimage until he spent his last days in the village of Tirukkuṟuṅguḍi in the Tinnevelly District.

Date of the Āḻvār.—It is not so easy, as one would imagine, to determine the date of this Āḻvār. According to the legends, Tirumaṅgai was a contemporary of Tirujñāna Sambandar whom he met at Śīyāḻi and spent some time with him there. As the date of the Śaiva saint is accepted generally as the middle of the seventh century A.D. and as other references relegate this Āḻvār to a much later date, it would be wrong to identify with Sambandar, the Nāyaṉār, who was the contemporary of Tirumaṅgai. If this is to be accepted the Śaiva saint referred to should be Sundaramūrti.

There are of course sufficient materials to determine the age of this Āḻvār from independent sources. Of these there is an unimpeachable reference to the drum of Pallavamalla, who is no other than Nandivarman Pallavamalla (circa A.D. 710—75), who was succeeded by Dantivarman. Hence this date is the upper limit of the age of Tirumaṅgai[1]. The Āḻvār again refers to Vayiramēga a

[1] Gopinātha Rao's *History of Śri Vaiṣṇavas*, pp. 24-5.

surname of Dantidurga Rāṣṭrakūṭa,[1] a contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla.[2]

His Works.—The pious robber was a learned poet. He owed his learning to the deep grace of the Lord. His poems are of a highly philosophical type and go by the name of *Periyatirumoḻi, Tirukkuṟuntāṇḍakam, Tiruneḍuntāṇḍakam, Eḻukūṟṟirukkai, Śiṟiyatirumaḍal* and *Periyatirumaḍal.* These six poems form a supplement as it were to the four *prabandas* of Nammāḻvār. It may be noticed in passing that while the literary works of Nammāḻvār are compared to the four Vedas, those of Tirumaṅgai are compared to the six Vēdāṅgas. Hence the Vaiṣṇavas call the joint work of these two āḻvārs the Tamiḻ Vēda.[3]

Of these the *Śiṟiyatirumaḍal* and the *Periyatirumaḍal* are erotic in form like the *Tirukkōvai.* Whereas the *kōvai* relates to bilateral love, the *maḍal* deals with unilateral love, that is, the love of one to another which however is not reciprocated by that other. The *maḍals* in question are erotic in form but in form only. A deep spiritual significance underlies the highly devotional songs of the great Tirumaṅgai. Here the famous saint fancies himself a lady in deep love with the Lord and manifests his intense desire of love towards Him, and even goes to the length of threatening that he would do the last and worst thing, namely, subjecting himself to such severe tribulations and sufferings as would lead to death itself, if the Lord did not reciprocate his heart's desire which is no less than intimate spiritual union with Himself.

[1] *Ep Ind.* iv, p. 334; *Q. J. M. Society,* xiii, pp. 581-8 and pp. 698-700.

[2] See also M. Rāghava Ayyangar's *Āḻvārkaḷ-Kālanilai,* p. 89 ff. and 180 ff. *Ind. Ant.,* 1906; S. K. Ayyangar's article on *Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār* in his *Early History of Vaiṣṇavism,* p. 88.

[3] See *Guruparamparais* (Vaḍagalai and Teṅgalai versions).

4. ĀṆḌĀḶ[1]

The Legend.—In the ancient village of Villipputtūr, sacred to the memory of Periyāḻvār, whose unflinching devotion to the Lord Viṣṇu was beyond limit, Āṇḍāḷ, the jewel among the mystics, was born about A.D. 716. The story goes that when once Periyāḻvār was engaged as usual in gathering flowers from the local flower-garden he discovered a baby-girl underneath the basil plants. His happiness knew no bounds. He took the baby home and brought up the young *Kōdai* as he named her. While young she was able to learn the highly philosophical works, and her bent of mind was not worldly but was fully directed towards the Lord Viṣṇu. She is also known as Nācciyār and Śūḍik-koḍuttāḷ.[2]

About the latter name Śūḍik-koḍuttāḷ, there again hangs a story. Her father Periyāḻvār was in the habit of gathering flowers in the morning and weaving them into garlands to be used for the object of his worship during the period of prayer. It would appear that Āṇḍāḷ's devotion to the Lord was so intense that she took herself to be the loving partner of the Lord. Hence, without the knowledge of her father, she used to deck herself with those flowerwreaths intended for the Lord, to satisfy herself whether she was a sufficiently beautiful figure to be attracted by the Lord Himself.

Sometime before her father would offer his worship, she used to remove those flowers, for use in the *pūja*. This went on, until one day Periyāḻvār noticed a hair in the garland, hence unfit to be offered to the Lord. He was anxious to know how this came about, and when questioned, the faithful daughter could no more hide the

[1] Cf. *Divyasūricaritam*, p. 66 ff., also *Dravida Saints*, p. 41 ff.
[2] சூடிக்கொடுத்தாள்.

fact. He was sorry, and performed the *pūja* without flowers. That night there appeared the Lord in his dream and said that flowers which once adorned Āṇḍāḷ would alone be acceptable to Him.

Now Periyāḻvār recognized the greatness of his daughter. Āṇḍāḷ became sufficiently aged to be married. The father was anxious to get for her a suitable husband. When Āṇḍāḷ heard of the arrangements which were being made by her father in regard to her marriage, she informed him that she would not marry any mortal being but was going to get herself wedded to the Lord enshrined at Śriraṅgam.[1] The poor father did not know what to do. The Lord appeared to him in a dream and asked him to take his daughter to his *sannadhi* in the Śriraṅgam temple. As ordered Periyāḻvār took Āṇḍāḷ in wedding dress to the Holy Presence and to the wonderment of all the visitors, the Lord extended His hands and took her in loving embrace, when Āṇḍāḷ disappeared as if in the air. Though the father was pleased to secure the Lord Himself as his son-in-law, still he was sorry for her separation from him. To such feelings he has given vent in his *Tirumoḻi*.[2]

Date.—According to the *Guruparamparais*, it is said that Āṇḍāḷ was born on a Tuesday, in the year Nala, in the month of Āṣāḍha, Śuklacaturdaśi, Pūranakṣatra. According to the late Swāmikannu Pillai's calculation this date corresponds to June 25, A.D. 776. This date could not be taken as conclusive inasmuch as other authoritative works like the *Divyasūricaritam* dealing with the lives of Āḻvārs do not make mention of this fact, namely, the date of her birth. This omission together with other lines of evidence gces to show, as we have

[1] *மானிடவர்க்கென்று பேச்சுப்படில் வாழகில்லேன்.*

[2] See Periyāḻvār *Tirumoḻi*, 3, 8.

already said, that A.D. 716 is the year in which our mystic poetess was born. This date is based chiefly on certain verses in the 13th *Tiruppāvai* of Āṇḍāḷ herself.[1]

This passage refers not merely to the rising of Śukra (*veḷḷi*) but also to the simultaneous setting of Guru (*viyāḻan*). According to astronomical calculations this could have been only on December 18, A.D. 731. This was the date, then, of the composition of *Tiruppāvai*, when Āṇḍāḷ must have been aged about fifteen. If this is correct, she must have been born in the year 716.[2]

Her Works.—The chief works attributed to this celebrated poetess are the *Tiruppāvai muppatu* (30), and *Nācciyār Tirumoḻi* (153). The *Tiruppāvai* is an interesting work. It celebrates what is known as *pāvai nōṉbu* which is the occasion of a vowed observance by young girls in the month of Mārgaḻi (December-January), the object being to secure good husbands for themselves and the prosperity of their country. The extant work celebrates such a festival indulged in by the maidens of the Yādava caste in honour of Kaṇṇapirāṉ (Lord Krisṇa). In this work again she expresses herself, on having attained womanhood, that she would stand by her firm resolution to wed no human being but only the Lord.[3]

[1] பிள்ளைக ளெல்லாரும் பாவைக் களம்புக்கார்
வெள்ளி யெழுந்து வியாழ முறங்கிற்றுப்
புள்ளுஞ் சிலம்பினகாண் போதரிக் கண்ணினாய்.

[2] See for full details M. Rāghava Ayyangar's *Āḻvārkaḷ-Kālanilai*, pp. 74-94.

[3] 'அவரைப் பிராயந் தொடங்கி யென்றும்
ஆதரித் தெழுந்தவென் தடமுலைகள்
துவரைப் பிரானுக்கே சங்கற் பித்துத்
தொழுதுவைத்தே னொல்லை விதிக்கிற்றியே'

'ஊனுடை யாழிசங் குத்தமர்க்கென்
றுன்னித் தெழுந்தவென் தடமுலைகள்
மானிடவர்க் கென்று பேச்சுப்படில்
வாழகில்லேன் கண்டாய் மன்மதனே'

In the other work *Tirumoḻi*, Āṇḍāḷ has decided to bestow her love on Tirumāl only and not to seek any other husband. She regards Viṣṇu as the lover and herself as the object of love. She addresses the Lord with such feelings as are natural to one separated from one's lover, and yearning for spiritual union with Him. The keenness of separation and her consequent difficulties are told with a wealth of detail.[1]

In one place she seems to think that the Lord has definitely promised to take her in loving embrace and has either forgotten it or did not take notice of her, a small human being. Whatever it may be, she continues, the Lord cannot so easily deceive her father through whom she has full hopes of realizing her ambition.[2]

We also know how she realized this to the full extent of her satisfaction. Mysticism in the case of Āṇḍāḻ is something more than formal.

Lack of space forbids us to go here into more details of Āṇḍāḻ's works, and also those of the other equally

1 ஒளிவண்ணம் வளைசிந்தை யுறக்கத்தோ டிவையெல்லாம்
எளிமையா லிட்டென்னை யீடழியப் போயினவால்
குளிரருவி வேங்கடத்தென் கோவிந்தன் குணம்பாடி
அளியத்த மேகங்காள் ஆவிகாத் திருப்பேனே.
கோங்கலரும் பொழில் மாலிருஞ்சோலையிற் கொன்றைகண்மேல்
தூங்குபொன் மாலைகளோ டுடனாய்நின்று தூங்குகின்றேன்
பூங்கொள் திருமுகத்து மடுத்தூதிய சங்கொலியும்
சார்ங்கவில் நாணொலியுந் தலைப்பெய்வ தென்ஞான்று கொலோ.

2 நல்லவென் தோழி! நாகணைமிசை நம்பரர்
செல்வர் பெரியர் சிறுமானிடர்யாஞ் செய்வதென்
வில்லி புதுவைநகர் விட்டுசித்தர் தங்கள் தேவரை
வல்ல பரிசு வருவிப்பரேல் அது காண்டுமே.
செம்மை யுடைய திருவரங்கர் தாம்பணித்த
மெய்ம்மைப் பெருவார்த்தை விட்டுசித்தர் கேட்டிருப்பர்
தம்மை யுகப்பாரைத் தாமுகப்பா ரென்னுஞ்சொல்
தம்மிடையே பொய்யானாற் சாதிப்பா ராரினியே.

Nācciyār Tirumoḻi, 10.10; 11.10.

reputed Āḻvārs. 'They cover a wide field, ranging from the simple plaintive songs of Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi to the thought-laden odes of Nammāḻvār, from the polished poems of Kulaśēkara Āḻvār to the mystical love songs of Āṇḍāḷ. . . . The songs of the Vaiṣṇava singers taken along with those of the contemporary Śaiva poets—both considerably similar and alike in their poetry and spiritual contents—form the earliest and most remarkable religious poetry known to any Indian vernacular.'[1] 'The age of Tamil mystics and poets was also the great age of Tamil art. The theistic cults of Śiva and Viṣṇu which gave rise to high poetry also inspired an art renaissance, the greatest South India has ever seen.'[2] Suffice it to say in respect of these Śaiva as well as Vaiṣṇava Samayācāryas in general with the English poet:

> Blessed are they who peaceably should endure,
> For Thou, O Most Highest, shalt give them a crown.

Sec. IV. OTHER MYSTIC POETS

1. TIRUMŪLAR

The Legend.—In the sacred hills of Kailāsa, the abode of Lord Śiva, there are many disciples of god Nandi, all of them being followers of Śiva and Śiva-yōga. Once, one among them set out to the Podiyil hill of Agastya to spend some time with that sage. Having passed through many a place of pilgrimage, he reached Tiruvāvaḍuturai, near the present Kumbakōṇam town. There he heard in the distance the sad bellowing of cattle continuously for a long time. He went to the place and found the cowherd Mūla by name dead on the ground surrounded by the faithful cows and calves, bemoaning the loss of their kind

[1] See p. 17 of *Nammāḻvār* (G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras).
[2] See p. 46 *Appar* (G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras).

master. This sight aroused his sympathy and in order to bring solace to the afflicted animals, he entered into the dead body of Mūla and gave life to it. The cattle were pleased, went about grazing and returned home at nightfall as usual followed by Tirumūla. The animals had gone to their sheds. Tirumūla was found standing alone in the street and did not enter his house. His wife who was not aware of what had happened to her husband, took Tirumūla for him and requested him to get into the house. The Nāyaṉār said abruptly that there was no relationship between him and her. The faithful lady became bewildered and passed a sleepless and restless night. Next morning she broke the news to her relatives and neighbours. They found Tirumūla in *samādhi* in the village *maṭha,* unmindful of what was happening outside. The lady fell down unconscious and was removed home by the villagers. It is said that the duration of the *samādhi* was as long as 3,000 years when he composed the *Tirumantiram* in[1] four parts *cariyai, kiriyai, yōgam* and *jñānam.*

The name of this great author stands perhaps unrivalled in the domain of Tamil writers in general, and of mystic ones in particular. But his mysticism is neither purely formal nor purely material. It may be well remarked that it is a harmonious blending of both the formal and the material. The book which is a masterpiece in itself contains 3,000 stanzas, dealing with a variety of subjects numbering four hundred themes and even more. It speaks of both the possible and the impossible, the practicable and the impracticable, great as well as trivial things. Tradition recounts that this was a work extending over 3,000 years,

[1] See *Periyapurāṇam,* ed. 1903, pp. 506-9; also *Periyapurāṇavacanam* (14th edition).

one stanza being composed every year, the whole year being more or less a period of probation, for the composing of this one stanza.[1] The following out of many could be quoted as typical illustrations of its mystical tendencies. In what is known as the *śūnyasampāṣaṇai* chapter of the *Tirumantiram* it is said that 'When the *brinjal* seed was planted, *pākal* another species of vegetable of sour and bitter taste, grew out of it. When the earth was dug out, a *poośaṇi* (another vegetable of grey colour) appeared. The gardeners ran to fetch them. But it was a plantain that was fully ripe.'[2] This is the literal meaning of the stanza. But what underlies this is of enormous importance. The brinjal in Tamil is *kattiri* which also means a pair of scissors. According to the Hindu Yōga treatises, there are two main tubes through which the life-breath passes in and out, running diagonal-wise down, from the toe of the foot up to the nostril. By controlling and regulating the passage of air through these tubes by means of *prāṇāyāma*, a man is enabled to attain the state of *Vairāgya*. That is when the mind ceases to function, and is at rest, it is easy to realize God. The plantain fruit refers to the salvation of the soul or *mōkṣa* in Sanskrit, of which the Bible says: 'What if you gain the whole world, but lose your own soul.'

Another stanza[3] says:

[1] *Ibid.*, st. 25-8.

[2] 'வழுதலை வித்திடப் பாகன் முளைத்தது
புழுதியைத் தோண்டினேன் பூசணி பூத்தது
தொழுதுகொண் டோடினார் தோட்டக் குடிகண்
முழுதும் பழுத்தது வாழைக் கனியே.'

9th tantra, 23, 4.

[3] 'பார்ப்பா ணகத்திலே பாற்பசு வைந்துண்டு
மேய்ப்பாரு மின்றி வெறித்துத் திரிவன
மேய்ப்பாரு முண்டாய் வெறியு மடங்கினால்
பார்ப்பான் பசுவைந்தும் பாலாச் சொரியுமே.'

'There are five cows in the Brahman's house. They roam astray. If they are controlled by the proper herdsman, then all the five would furnish plenty of milk.' The mystic interpretation is that a *mumukṣu* or the one who wishes to attain the eternal enjoyment of bliss, should keep his five senses under strict control and watch.

Again it is said that:

'The boat is taken to the shore by the steersman for commercial purposes. If in the middle of the way, the keel gives way, the consequence is easily imaginable'.[1] This poem expounds the great truth contained in what is known in Sanskrit philosophy '*Thou art that.*' Here the body is the vessel on which the *Jīvātman* or the Individual Soul travels to the place where the *Paramātman* or the Universal Soul is, there to become united with it. In plain words the body is the vehicle for the attainment of salvation.

Thus, a careful examination of these three stanzas manifests clearly that the mysticism here is not only formal, but also material. The language is obscure, and the matter also not easily intelligible.

Date.—There is not enough material to ascertain his chronology. But from the fact that Sundaramūrti refers to him as one of the sixty-three Nāyanmārs in his *Tiruttoṇḍattohai* of the *Tēvāram*, it is reasonable to assume that he must have been Sundarmūrti's predecessor.

1 'தோணி யொன்றுண்டு துறையில் விடுவது
வாணி மிதித்துநின் றைவர் கோலூன்றலும்
வாணிபஞ் செய்வார் வழியிடை யாற்றிடை
யாணி கலங்கி னதுவிது வாமே' *Ibid.*, 70.

TĀYUMĀṈAVAR

The Legend.—Among the later Tamil mystic poets and writers, the names of Tāyumāṉavar and Rāmaliṅga Svāmigaḷ deserve to be specially mentioned. A study of the life of Tāyumāṉavar is indeed interesting. In the village of Vedāraṇyam (Tirumaṟaikkāḍu in Tamil), there lived about A.D. 1700 a Śaiva, Kēdiliyappapillai by name. At that time the reigning chieftain at Trichy named Vijayaraghunātha Chokkaliṅga Nāyakar had him appointed in his service in which he ably conducted himself. He had a son whom he gave in adoption to his eldest brother who was without any issue. But the desire to have another son possessed his mind, and with his wife he went daily to the temple and offered prayers to that effect. He was soon blessed with a son whom he named Tāyumāṉavar after the Lord enshrined in the temple at Trichy. The child grew into boyhood and became a profound student of Śaiva literature. Meantime, his father died and the king who was attracted by the qualities and qualifications of this boy, appointed him to his father's post. The office had no attraction for him. He thought of temples and gods and how to attain godhood. One day he went to the temple as usual and found an ascetic sitting in contemplation of Him. He understood that it was *Maunaguru svāmi* of whom he had heard much before. He waited until he would rise up from his *yōgic* posture, and when he rose up with a book in hand, Tāyumāṉavar went to him and politely asked for the name of the book and expressed a desire to be initiated into the mystery of *ātmajñāna*. The Svāmiji was pleased and promised to teach him the divine thing the next time he should meet him. Meanwhile the Svāmiji asked him to look after his official work and to lead the life of a householder.

With great reluctance he returned home and attended to his duties.

It so happened that the king died leaving no heir to succeed him, except his wife Mīnākṣiammaiyār. The latter invited Tāyumāṉavar and expressed her wish to marry him and to place him at the head of the realm. This did not appeal to him. He advised her the true righteous path and left for Rāmēśvaram. This news reached his people at Vēdāraṇyam and the elder brother arranged for his marriage at Vēdāraṇyam itself. Tāyumāṉavar agreed and got married. A son was born to him, but his wife died. The boy was named Kanakasabhāpati and grew to be learned. Now there appeared the *Maunagurusvāmi* and permitted him to don the robes of a sannyāsin and instructed him in the Śivayōga. From that day he became a wandering ascetic, visited a number of sacred places of pilgrimage and at last got his *samādhi* in Lakṣmīpuram near Rāmnād.[1]

His Mysticism.—Tāyumāṉavar is mystic in the sense that he speaks from an altogether lofty plane, something transcendental, and hence beyond ordinary human comprehension. Like other mystics, he longs for direct communion with the Lord. While other mystics yearn for a union with particular deities like Nārāyaṇa, Subrahmaṇya, etc., the conception of our poet-saint regarding the Lord is something formless and void, and shows him to be a devotee of Śiva.[2] He realizes the whole universe as being permeated by the formless Being.[3] His work is full of a number of devotional lyrics dealing with

[1] For detailed information, see Intro., pp. 3-15, of *Tāyumāṉavar Pāṭal* with *Meykaṇḍa virutti.* Published by B. Ratna Nayakar & Sons, Madras, 1927.

[2] Sec. *Sollaṟkkariyar,* st. 9.

[3] See the whole section entitled எங்கு நிறைகின்ற பொருள்

several aspects and attributes of the Universal God. The mysticism, in which his whole work is clothed, ha for its objective an impersonal Being. This means tha Tāyumāṉavar does not feel the form or presence of Go in any definite manner. According to him God is Sat Cit-Ānanda—the everlasting bliss.[2] He soars high in the air of Advaitic philosophy,[3] and is full of lofty *advaitic conceptions,* though he was by convictio a follower of Siddhānta Śaiva.[4] It is a compromise between Advaita and Śaivism.

3. RĀMALIṄGASVĀMIGAḶ

The Legend.—In this continual and continued succession of mystics, Rāmaliṅgasvāmi of very recent times occupies a fit place. Rāmaliṅga Pillai was the third son of one Rāmiah Pillai and Ciṉṉammaiyār, residents of Marudūr village near Vappuliyūr. Rāmaliṅga was born in the year 1823 and the legend of his birth runs that once when Rāmiah Pillai was away from home, God Śiva appeared to Ciṉṉammaiyār in the form of an aged sannyāsin, and being pleased with her entertainment, the Lord blessed that she would soon get a famous son. So it happened. When young, his father passed away and it was his eldest brother who had him educated. Even as a boy, Rāmaliṅga was attached to Śiva temples and worship. He became master of all literature without being taught. He was sixteen when he had a burning desire to visit the sacred temple at Tiruvottiyūr. From that time he began to think of *ātma*, its real truth

[1] Sect. entitled *Poṉnaimādarai,* st. 43 and 44.
[2] See section entitled பரிபூரணானந்தம்.
[3] Sec. Ācaiyēnum, st. 28.
[4] பொய்கண்டார் காணாப் புனிதமெனு மத்துவித
மெய்கண்ட நாதனருண் மேவுநா ளெந்நாளோ?

p. 666.

and nature, and became a teacher and preacher. Noticing an attitude of resignation fast developing in his mind, his elder brother forced him to take to the life of a householder by getting him married to his own sister's daughter. But his unflinching faith and the devotion to the Lord of his choice did not dwindle. In a place called Vaḍalūr or Pārvatipuram, he built a temple of mystic significance in addition to a *dharmaśāla* and *pāṭaśāla.*[1]

His Work.—His great work *Aruṭpā* is a shining monument of his religious devotion, spiritual insight and poetical skill. The work is a collection of devotional songs uttered out of pure inspiration, yet fully satisfying the rules of prosody. In other words though inspiration is verily stamped on all his verses, yet the metrical tests are completely satisfied. This is only by the way.

The end of the Svāmiji.—The end of the life of the Svāmiji is a little interesting. We already referred to his building a temple at Vaḍalūr. Into a certain chamber in a cottage in the village of Mēṭṭukkuppam, near Vaḍalūr, the Svāmi retired for contemplation. He asked his disciples not to open the door until he returned; sometime after the door was opened and no vestiges of the Svāmiji were found. How and where he disappeared is a mystery even now. At that time he was fifty-one years old.

Sec. V. CONCLUSION

Thus there has been an unbroken and noble succession of religious mystics in the ancient land of the Tamils. By their unceasing and continued endeavours

[1] For a fuller account, see the introduction to the edition of Tiruvaruṭpāttirumuṟaittiraṭṭu, by V. Namaśivāya Mudaliyar (1896). Besides this old edition which is rare, we have also other editions of the work. Mention may be made of the edition by S.M. Kandaswāmi Pillai (Madras), 1924.

and labours, the lamp of religious faith is still kept burning in the minds of the great masses of the people of this land. The one result of it is that such useful institutions as the great temples are being abundantly multiplied, thus keeping alive the religious life of the masses in this world with the struggle for life and existence, and where people could not find time to stand face to face with the Lord. Thus these great religious mystics have sought by their writings to light the fire of religious zeal and enthusiasm in the minds of the people. Thanks to these mystics, our religion and our religious faith were saved from extinction during many an hour of peril and crisis.

Their writings, besides their religious value, form a good intellectual treat. To study, to understand and to fully realize these, is indeed very difficult. There are still passages that defy even the devoted students of Tamil literature.

A proper understanding and realization of such mystical writings is indeed difficult as it requires high acumen, deep vision, and clear understanding on the part of the ardent student. He should not approach the subject as a layman would. He should, on the other hand, place himself on a higher spiritual plane to comprehend thoroughly the mystical force involved. What is wanted is an approach to the subject in a pure spirit of awe and reverence, so that a correct appreciation of these works could be effected with a greater amount of power and strength.

CHAPTER IV

TIRUVAḶḶUVAR

Sec. I. THE CONCEPT OF MUPPĀL

WHATEVER be the date of the Aryan advent in Peninsular India,[1] one fact is clear, namely, that Aryan ideas and ideals had become completely popularized in Tamil India sometime during or before the epoch of the Śaṅgam. A study of the *nīti* texts in Sanskrit literature bears out that the state came into existence for the progressive realization of the *trivarga* or the *muppāl* of Tamil literature.[2] The conception was that progress of the world (*lōkayātra*) meant the progressive realization of the chief aims of life and these chief aims of life according to the then prevalent notions and standards were dharma (*Aṛam*), artha (*Poruḷ*) and kāma (*Iṉbam*). Though the end of this realization is mokṣa (*Vīḍu*) yet neither the *Arthaśāstra* writers of Sanskrit literature nor the political thinkers of the ancient Tamil land have thus expressed it. The idea was that the *Trivarga* was the means towards that end, and if once the means were realized, the end would automatically follow. That the importance of this *Trivarga* was well realized in Tamil India of the Śaṅgam period is evident from the *Tolkāppiyam* and the eighteen poems of *Kīḻkkaṇakku*, traditionally accepted as the Śaṅgam works. These eighteen poems among which the *Tirukkuṛaḷ* claims the first place of importance have for their object how best to realize the *trivarga* or the *muppāl* which would lead to the attainment of heaven. In his commentary

[1] The generally accepted date is 700 B.C.
[2] See author's *Hindu Administrative Institutions*, p. 35.

on the *Kuṛaḷ* the celebrated commentator Parimēlaḻagar refers to the indebtedness of Tiruvaḷḷuvar to the accredited authorities on *daṇḍanīti,* such as *Vyāḻaṉ* (Bṛhaspati) and *Veḷḷi* (Śukra). Unanimous Indian tradition records that Bṛhaspati and Śukra were the first political theorists to whom other writers including the illustrious Kauṭalya and the compiler of the Rājadharma section of the *Mahābhārata* were indebted.

Alleged indebtedness to Sanskrit.—In a recent publication in Tamil,[1] an attempt has been made to study the *Kuṛaḷ* from a Tamil point of view. It is contended that there is no warrant for the statements of the commentator Parimēlaḻagar in regard to the indebtedness of Vaḷḷuvar to Sanskrit authors, and that there is a marked difference in the classification of the *muppāl,* and that the concept of *muppāl* is the result of a slow process of evolution of the Tamil genius, and that the ideas underlying the *Kuṛaḷ* have no correspondence with those of Sanskrit writings.[2] We do not propose to examine here these views which are yet to be proved before they could be adopted as conclusive. It may be that the Tamilian genius developed itself on independent but parallel lines, and the process of such slow but sure development culminated in the genius of the *Tirukkuṛaḷ's* author.

Sec. II. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Whatever be the decision which future research will arrive at in regard to the above particulars, it is a fact of the utmost importance that the *Kuṛaḷ* and other poems of *Kīḻkkaṇakku* deal with the *trivarga* or the *muppāl.* Though a cursory examination of the

[1] *Studies in Tirukkural,* by R., P. Sēthu Pillai with a foreword by K. Subramania Pillai, Madras (1923).

[2] See the chapter entitled திருவள்ளுவரும், பரிமேலழகரும் *and especially* p. 163 ff.

work has been made already[1], still we shall proceed to examine the same in detail to know whether any facts could be gleaned out of the fiction that has gathered round this notable poet and philosopher. The chief sources of information for the life sketch of this author are the *Kapilar Ahaval* and the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*, while the Ceylon traditions as transmitted in its chronicles throw some welcome light. Besides, we have multifarious references in Tamil classical literature which go a long way to fix the chronological limits of Vaḷḷuvar's age.

Legends.—Of these the story contained in the *Kapilar Ahaval* belongs to the realm of pure mythology. A reference to this work and its value to the historian of Tamil India has already been made in our study of the Śaṅgam poet, Kapilar.[2] The story runs that he was the son of a Brahman, Bhagavaṉ by name, by his wife, a Pulaya woman, named Ādi. The circumstances which brought about their marriage are peculiar and quite incredible. One vow taken by them on the eve of the marriage was to give away their children as presents and retain none. It is said that the marriage was over and as time went by, they had seven children—four daughters and three sons. The four daughters were Uppai, Uṟuvai, Avvai and Vaḷḷi. These were presented to a washerman, a toddy-drawer, a pāṇan, and a kuṟava respectively, who brought them up. The three sons were Adigamāṉ, Kapilar, and Vaḷḷuvar. While Adigamāṉ became the adopted son of the chieftain of Vañji, Kapilar was brought up by a Brahman. Vaḷḷuvar was presented to one Vaḷḷuva, a resident of the modern Mylapore. Thus the parents fulfilled the vow which they took on the occasion of their marriage. Tradition further narrates that the adopted father introduced

[1] See *supra*, p. 38. [2] See *supra*, p. 54.

Vaḷḷuvar to the profession of weaving in which he spent his time.

Criticism of the Legend.—The story is so full of inaccuracies and incredible statements that we are afraid there is no basis of truth in it excepting the mention of the two names Bhagavan̲ and Ādi. These names are found in the first *Kuṛaḷ*[1] in the order of the Ādi-bhagavan̲, which means, the God of the Universe and has possibly nothing to do with his parentage. There is no reliable literary evidence, first in regard to his parents, his brothers and sisters, secondly his adoption by a Vaḷḷuva, thirdly his being brought up at Mylapore, and lastly his taking to the profession of a weaver. It seems that the ingenious author of the legend took up the compound word Ādi-bhagavan̲ in the first *Kuṛaḷ* and also the name of Vaḷḷuvan̲, and wove a story out of his fertile imagination. To repeat once again, it is a very late work and the account contained therein cannot be credited with any authenticity whatsoever.

The Story of the Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai.—The circumstances under which the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* came to be written, and the legend that has gathered round this, are of supreme interest. It is said that Vaḷḷuvar was not merely a weaver but also a man of letters and an erudite scholar.[2] His profound scholarship attracted to him Ēlēlasiṅga, a prominent merchant, who carried on overseas trade. Ēlēlasiṅga became much attracted to Vaḷḷuvar and accepted him as his teacher. At his request and for the use of his son, Vaḷḷuvar composed the great *Kuṛaḷ*. What was originally intended for a single individual has become the book of morals to be usefully read

1 'அகர முதல வெழுத்தெல்லா மாதி
பகவன் முதற்றே யுலகு.'

2 See *Abhidānacintāmaṇi.*

by the whole world. In that golden age when Vaḷḷuvar had the good fortune to live, it was the custom to get every literary work approved by the Śaṅgam Assembly then located at Madura.[1] In accordance with this practice, the book was taken to the Śaṅgam Hall. At that time, forty-nine poets were the guiding lights of the Academy. When the work was presented it met with opposition from all sides. It was remarked that it was an inferior composition much beneath the recognition of the Śaṅgam. But when it was pressed that it might be placed on the Śaṅgam plank and thus tested, it was agreed to. When once this was done, the Śaṅgam plank made enough room to be occupied by the book, to the utter surprise of the members of the Academy. They then recognized the great value of the work and placed the author in the first rank of the poets.

This was not all. Every one of the forty-nine realized his mistake in having rejected it in the first instance, and perhaps to make up for it, every one of them hailed it as a first class work by singing a verse in praise of the work, the *Kuṟaḷ* and its celebrated author. Iṟaiyaṉār (God Śiva in disguise) compared the poet's tongue to the *kalpa* flower. Goddess Sarasvatī claimed it as the Vēda itself. The king Ukkirap-peru Vaḻuti compared Vaḷḷuvar to Brahmā himself. Similar panegyrics were uttered by every one of the poets constituting the Śaṅgam. A collection of these songs was then made and thence it went by the name of *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*.

The story in the Ceylonese Chronicles.—Another source of information is the semi-legendary story of Ēlēlasiṅga as narrated in the Ceylon chronicles. These documents mention various incidents connected with the story of Alāra and the term *alāra* is only a

[1] See *supra*, p. 13.

corruption of the Tamil word *ēlēla*, the just and proper ruler that ever ruled the island of Ceylon. It is said that this Alāra or Ēlēla was a noble of the Cōḻa kingdom who invaded Ceylon with an army, had the local ruler Asēla defeated and slain, got himself crowned king of the island, and reigned for forty-four years from 145 to 101 B.C.[1] He ruled the island so justly and impartially that he was loved by all classes of people. The details of his administration of justice, such as hanging up a bell of justice to be rung by such as should be in need of justice, killing his son who had accidentally killed a calf, offering his head to be cut off as a penalty for unwittingly damaging a *stūpa*, need not detain us at present.[2] Apart from the story, what is of importance to us is, if Alāra or Ēlēla can be proved to be the Ēlēla, disciple and contemporary of Vaḷḷuvar, then there is a clue and a remarkable clue to attribute the author of the *Kuṟaḷ* to the second century B.C.

Criticism of the Legends.—The following arguments disprove the authenticity of the legends mentioned above. First the reference to semi-Brahmanical parentage is curious and unworthy of the birth-story of a saint like Vaḷḷuvar. The Ādi-bhagavaṉ in the first *kuṟaḷ veṇbā* refers to God and certainly not to his parents.

Secondly, Adigamāṉ is a king of much repute who is extolled by poets like Kapilar and Avvaiyār. Thirdly, the adoption of the poet by a Vaḷḷuva at Mylapore is yet to be proved. Even if this were proved there is the difficulty of interpreting the term Vaḷḷuva. Was it the name of a caste, or the name of a person, or name of an office, are questions, the answer to which is shrouded in deep mystery. Vaḷḷuva may

[1] *Mahāvaṁśa*, Ed. Wm. Geiger (1912), Intro., p. xxxvii.
[2] *Mahāvaṁśa*, S. B. of Ceylon, vol. i, pp. 107-10.

mean a member of the Depressed Classes, a priest, a foreteller, a nobleman, and an officer of the State. This interpretation could be sustained if the term could be identified with the Sanskrit term *vallabha*.[1]

Fourthly, there is nothing to corroborate the fact that Vaḷḷuvar took to the occupation of weaving.[2] What is all known is that Vaḷḷuvar was a native of Madura. But if we could credit the tradition in the *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam* with any authenticity, there is here a stanza attributed to Vaḷḷuvar himself where he says that his profession was weaving.[3]

From the fact that this line and the stanza wherein occurs this line admit of other interpretations, we cannot cite this as an authority to hang anything like a theory.

Fifthly, the circumstances narrated for the composition of the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* contain an epic interest not quite useful for purposes of historical investigation.

Sixthly, the introduction of Gods and Goddesses like Śiva, and Sarasvatī presupposes a super-human atmosphere far from being believed by ordinary men. The introduction of these deities detracts the value of the document as a reliable account.

Seventhly, the same epic and purāṇic interest centres round the story of the Alāra in the Ceylon traditions. How this story is an authentic one it is not possible to say.

Probable Historical data of the Legends.—In spite of such inconsistencies and incredibilities, the legends could not be set aside as affording no value to a student of history. Bereft of the story, the *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* bears out the suggestion that Vaḷḷuvar was

[1] See *The Tamilian Friend*, vol. x, pp. 7-9.

[2] See the twenty-first poem of *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* attributed to Nalkūrvēḷviyār.

[3] இழை நக்கி நூனெருடு மேழை.

a member of the so-called third Śaṅgam and a contemporary of some of the celebrated Śaṅgam poets. We can also gather that he bore the name of Vaḷḷuvar. It may be that the saint belonged to the Vaḷḷuvakkuḍi, a community whose profession was to publish Government orders by beat of drum. It is the interesting suggestion of Professor Rangācāriyar that the term *Vaḷḷuvar* is equal to *Rājanya* in Sanskrit literature, and that from the political and practical wisdom he displays in the book,[1] Vaḷḷuvar must have held one of the high offices of the State. We are reminded of the fact that a political theorist like Kauṭalya wrote his treatise, the *Arthaśāstra* for his *Narēndra* or king Candragupta. In a similar manner Vaḷḷuvar might possibly have done this as a guide to his friend Ēlēla or his son. It is also possible that just as Kauṭalya was appointed Chancellor of the Empire, Vaḷḷuvar might have been chosen for a high office of the State. Though there is nothing impossible in this, yet, there is nothing definite to venture a conjecture like this. If this could be proved, it would falsify the suggestion that the term denoted the caste, and not office or occupation.

Sec. III. THE AGE OF TIRUVAḶḶUVAR

While we are roaming about in a world of conjectures and imaginary pictures basing each on a single word or expression accidentally used or met with, it is preposterous to take up the examination of the date of the composition of the *Kuṛaḷ*. What is gratifying to note is that there is not such hopeless bewilderment in regard to this particular topic. There are three theories that now hold the field. One is that he was a late writer and his date could not have been earlier than the sixth century

[1] See *Studies in Śaṅgam History, Ed. Review,* October 1928.

A.D.[1] The other is that he flourished sometime in the first century A.D.[2] The third is that he must have lived in the first or second century B.C. As we shall see subsequently the cumulative weight of evidence is in favour of the last date. The following facts lead on to this assumption:—

1. The Ceylon traditions assign his contemporaneity with Ēlēla or Alāra of Ceylon who flourished from 144 to 101 B.C.

2. The extant *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai,* literally the garland of Tiruvaḷḷuvar is an anthology of panegyric verses sung by every one of the poets who constituted the Śaṅgam during Vaḷḷuvar's time, thus pointing to the universal appreciation of his great work. Most of these poets flourished in the early centuries of the Christian era.

3. If the books dealing with *Aṛam* and *Poruḷ* or politics are indebted to Sanskrit Dharmaśāstras and Arthaśāstras as the didactic nature of the poem warrants, and as Parimēlaḻagar would have it, then, the *Poruḷ* portion which finds multifarious correspondence with the prescriptions of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra,* must be one or two centuries after the *Arthaśāstra* which is generally accepted as a composition of the fourth century B.C.

4. The correspondence to ideas found in the later Sanskrit literature such as *Pañcatantra, Hitōpadēśa, Kāmandakīya* and *Bhartṛhari* is due to the fact that these works simply incorporated the floating *nīti* verses and hence could not necessarily be a source of information to Vaḷḷuvar's work. The source may be common to all.

5. Māmūlaṉār, an accredited Śaṅgam poet, from the fact of his referring to the flooding of the Ganges on the city of Pāṭaliputra, and his non-mentioning

[1] *History of the Tamils,* p. 588.
[2] See G. S. Duraisamy, *Tamil Literature,* p. 89.

of the fire which consumed it later on, must have lived at the commencement of the Christian era or even before. His reference to the *Kuṟaḷ* is valuable as it shows beyond doubt that Vaḷḷuvar lived before him or at least was his contemporary.[1]

6. The Poem has again won the appreciation and approval of Śīttalai Śāttaṉār, the author of the *Maṇimēkalai*.[2] We know that this Śāttaṉār was a friend of Iḷankō-Aḍigaḷ, the illustrious author of the *Śilappadikāram*. Both were contemporaries of king Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ Cēra who is said to have flourished in the second century after Christ. That the *Kuṟaḷ* must be very much earlier than the author of the *Maṇimēkalai*[3] can be gathered from an unquestionable reference to Vaḷḷuvar. From the circumstance in which this reference occurs, we can claim a far greater antiquity for Vaḷḷuvar than is generally accorded. The lines are put into the mouth of the deity at the *būtaśatukkam*, who is reported to have referred it to a Brahmana lady Marudi, on whom the son of the king of the land Kakandaṉ cast eyes of love desirous of sexual union. Kakandaṉ, according to the story, is a king and contemporary of the mythical hero Paraśurāma, the slayer of the Kṣatriya monarchs. It is interesting to note that the *Kuṟaḷ* is quoted as an authority in narrating the incident of such old times, as the days of Paraśurāma.

It may be noted in passing that this poet called Vaḷḷuvar *Poyyil-pulavaṉ* literally the true poet. Śāttaṉār's appreciation is further confirmed by the poem of his contemporary Maruttuvaṉ Dāmōdaraṉār.[4]

[1] (*Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*, st. 8). See for Māmūlaṉār's date author's *Mauryan Polity*.
[2] *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*, st. 10.
[3] 'பெய்யெனப் பெய்யும் பெருமழை யென்றவப்
பொய்யில் புலவன் பொருளுரை தேருய்' *Kādai*, 22, ll. 60-61.
[4] *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai*, st. 11.

7. The *Śilappadikāram* which cannot be later than the end of the second century A.D.[1] quotes with approval from the extant *Tirukkural*. To quote a work as authority it must have been popular for some time and there is thus an irrefutable testimony to point out that it was a composition much older than the *Śilappadikāram*.

8. The literary data and the peculiar *veṇbā* metre which it employs in the sūtra style of Sanskrit literature of that period afford further proof of the ancient character of the work.

Sec. IV. THE RELIGION OF VALLUVAR

The genius of Tiruvalluvar consists in having produced a treatise on pure ethics which is the common property of all religions in the world. The moral code that has been presented to us contains *nīti* gems which would serve the world for all time to come. The maxims promulgated are of such universal application that they have evoked wide appreciation and approval as is seen from English and Latin translations of the book. The *Kuraḷ* which claims an age of 2,000 years and more is still young and will be young, for it has been written for practical application for all time and in all places. The beauty of the work lies in its catering to the needs and desires of all religionists and creeds. Despite any serious and detailed study with regard to the religion of Valluvar, it is difficult to arrive at some definite conclusion. Rather we are compelled to go back to

1 *முற்பகற் செய்தான் பிறன்கேடு தன்கேடு*
பிற்பகற் காண்குறூ உம் பெற்றிகாண்
Cf. *Kādai*, 21, ll. 3-4.

பிறர்க்கின்னா முற்பகற் செய்யிற் றமக்கின்னா
பிற்பகற் றாமே வரும்
Kuraḷ, 319.

where we started and to remain in a state of doubt as to the personal religion of the celebrated author. For, every religion including Christianity claims him.

Was he a Christian?—The followers of Christianity identify,[1] without any justification whatever, Ēlēlasinga with the apostle St. Thomas, and as Ēlēla is said to be the patron of the poet-moralist, it may be that Vaḷḷuvar also embraced the same creed. European Tamil scholars of the last century like Fr. Beschi and Pope were specially attracted by that incomparable ethical code and rendered it in European languages, Latin and English. It may be noted in passing that these scholars were mainly Christian ecclesiastics.

Was he a Jaina?—It is again argued that he was a Jaina. The epithets[2] *Malarmiśai yēkiṉāṉ, aindavittāṉ aṟavāḻiyantaṇaṉ* are generally interpreted as denoting the *Arhat* and the philosophical ideas of the *arhats.* The references to Indra and the doctrine of *ahimsā* are also urged in support of the same theory. How slippery is the foundation of this theory can be gauged from the following. The expression *malarmiśai yēkiṉāṉ* which means, 'He who stands in the human heart,' is nothing more than the grand idea expressed in the *Bhagavadgītā* that the Lord God[3] is seated in the heart of all creatures. The *aindavittāṉ* is a common idea of the Hindus that he who conquered his five senses could become a *yōgin,* and attain godhood. The term *aravāḻiyantaṇaṉ* may mean the law-giver, the law-administrator, or the law-maker. Again, the cult of Indra-worship is again common to all sects of Hinduism including Buddhism and

[1] See *Studies in Saṅgam History, Ed. Review,* October, 1929.
[2] மலர்மிசையேகினான் (3) ஐந்தவித்தான் (25) அறவாழி அந்தணன் (8.)
[3] Īśvarah sarvabhūtānām hṛddēśē Arjuna tiṣṭati.

Jainism. In fact Indra is one of the principal Vēdic deities invoked in the sacred *yajñas.* The doctrine of *ahimsā* does not belong only to the Jaina cult. It is a fundamental doctrine of the *Upaniṣads,* the philosophical sections of the Vēdic literature. As Parimēlalagar points out, we have to interpret his sayings broadly, and not narrow them down as a sectarian work. At the least it is not possible to make out a strong case for its sectarian character.

Was he a Buddhist?—That he was also a votary of Buddhism is again claimed by some scholars whose chief argument is based on the section entitled *tuṛavu.*[1] The *Kuṛaḷ* 348 is specially quoted as prescribing renunciation as the cure for all ills.[2] A corroborative clue is said to be afforded by the expression of the same ideas in the *Maṇimēkalai.*[3] But renunciation is the ideal preached in all creeds. For example, the same *Kuṛaḷ* is quoted as expounding a concept of Śaiva Siddhānta.[4]

Was he a Vaiṣṇavite?—That he embraced the Vaiṣṇava creed and was a devotee of Viṣṇu is proved by the first *kuṛaḷ veṇbā* which finds a parallel in the *Gītā*[5] where the Lord says that He was the first letter (अ) among the letters.[6] In another informing *kuṛaḷ-veṇbā* more light is thrown on this topic. There is a distinct reference to the Vaikuṇtha as the abode of *Tāmaraik-kaṇṇaṉ* literally the lotus-eyed. The idea in this *kuṛaḷ-veṇbā* is that righteous people, after death find their home in the

[1] Ch. 35, st. 341 ff.

[2] துறவறம் as against இல்லறம்.

[3] Canto vi, ll. 72-3.

[4] See நெஞ்சுவிடுதூது being one of the 14 *Śaiva Siddhānta* works, cf. footnote, p. 100 of the *Kuṛaḷ,* edited by Āṛumuga Nāvalar, Eleventh Edition.

[5] अक्षराणामकारोऽस्मि ।

[6] 1103 of the *Kuṛaḷ.*

abode of Viṣṇu who is said to be the lotus-eyed. Life after death in Vaikuṇṭha is clearly the Vaiṣṇava idea and this, when compared with the first verse of prayer with which the *Kuṟaḷ* opens, may lend weight to the view that he was a follower of Vaiṣṇavism.

Was he a Śaiva?—There are again some *kuṟaḷ-veṇbās* which go to demonstrate that the author was a Śaiva by religion. The phrase *eṇguṇattāṉ*[1] is generally quoted to show his adherence to Śaivism. It is significant to note that Śaiva saints like Appar and Sundaramūrti use the very term in their laudatory stanzas on Śiva. *Eṇguṇattāṉ* simply means the God with eight attributes.[2] Again the *kuṟaḷ-veṇba* (359) is believed to be the Śaiva idea as it has been utilized in an accredited *Śaiva Siddhānta* work with approval.[3] To this may be added the *kuṟaḷ-veṇba* (348) which has been used in another *Śaiva Siddhānta* work as we have seen already.

Conclusion.—The examination of the personal religion of Vaḷḷuvar does not give us any definite lead in the matter. The fact seems to be that the author, whatever his personal religion, did not wish to give his work a sectarian character.[4] If we can hazard a conjecture, Vaḷḷuvar who was acquainted with different creeds and faiths, took up the best in every creed and thus primarily intended to be a moralist rather than a religious teacher. The *Kuṟaḷ* is like the *Bhagavadgītā* which appeals to

[2] For a variant classification of these attributes, the reader is referred to the footnotes of the *Kuṟaḷ*, pp. 7-8, Eleventh Edition.

சார்புணர்ந்து சார்புகெட வொழுகின் மற்றழித்துச்
சார்தரா சார்தரு நோய்.

[3] See Tirukkaḷiṟṟuppaṭiyār of Tirukkaḍavūr Uyyavanda-Dēvanāyaṉār, cf. footnote on p. 104 of the *Kuṟal*.

[4] See the learned article of Vidvān R. Rāghava Ayyangar in the *Sen Tamiḻ*, vol. i, p. 4, quoted in the introduction to his edition of the *Kuṟaḷ*, by Paṇḍit M. Rāghava Ayyangar.

every faith, and which admits of any interpretation looked at from any point of view. In fact it is the correct estimate of poet Kallāḍaṉār who says 'Among the six religious creeds, the followers of one creed will assert that there is only one eternal thing. The followers of a second creed will speak of another thing. The followers of the third creed will speak of yet another. But it is good that the followers of all creeds accept the pronounced prescriptions of Vaḷḷuvar's *muppāl*."[1] As has been already indicated, if Parimēlaḻagar's views could be adopted, then the author of the *Kuṟaḷ* must have been familiar with Sanskrit literature and especially the Dharmaśāstra and the Arthaśāstra literature. If this position can be accepted, it is reasonable to assume that Tiruvaḷḷuvar follows mainly in his *Aṟattuppāl* the most popular *Dharmaśāstra* of Manu, in his *Poruṭpāl* the well-known *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya, and in his *Kāmattuppāl* the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana. To these may be added portions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* and other allied literature. Whether Vaḷḷuvar's *muppāl* is an independent growth or is indebted to Sanskrit literature, it is for future research to determine conclusively. As it is, there is a remarkable parallelism between the *Kuṟaḷ* and the Sanskrit books above referred to. We propose in the following pages to give a list of such of the *Kuṟaḷ-veṇbās* which have a striking correspondence with those in the Sanskrit works devoted to subjects like *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma*. This list does not, however, pretend to exhaust all the corresponding references.

[1] ஒன்றே பொருளெனின் வேறென்ப வேறெனி
னன்றென்ப வாறு சமயத்தார் — நன்றென
வெப்பா லவரு மியைபவே வள்ளுவனார்
முப்பால் மொழிந்த மொழி.

Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai, st. 9.

Sec. V, Book I. AṞATTUPPĀL

Coming to the first division of the book Parimēlaḻagar classifies it into two sections broadly *Illaṟam* or the *dharma* pertaining to domestic life and *Tuṟavaṟam* or the *dharma* pertaining to renunciation of the world. There is another view that the whole book dealing with *aṟam* denotes the four *āśramas* of the Hindu view of life—*brahmacarya, gārhaspatya, vānaprasta and sannyāsa.* The duties of the first two *āśramas* apparently constitute the first twenty-four chapters. While the next ten chapters (25-34) deal with the duties of the third *āśrama,* the following three chapters (35-37) are devoted to the *sannyāsa.*[1]

The *Kuṟaḷ* says:[2]

'A, as its first of letters, every speech maintains;
The "Primal Deity" is First through all the world's domains.'

The *Bhagavadgītā*[3] expresses similar ideas: I am the letter 'A' among the alphabets, the compound among the whole class of compounds; I am the Eternal Kāla and the Creator of the universe.

According to the *Kuṟaḷ*:[4]

'His feet, "Who over the fullblown flower hath past," who gain
In bliss long time shall dwell above this earthly plain.'

[1] See *Sen Tamiḻ,* vol. i, p. 245 ff.

[2] I have followed Pope's translation of the *Kuṟaḷ.*
அகர முதல வெழுத்தெல்லா மாதி
பகவன் முதற்றே யுலகு. (1)

[3] अक्षराणामकारोऽस्मि द्वन्द्वस्सामासिकस्य च
अहमेवाक्षयः कालो धाताहं विश्वतोमुखः ॥ x. 33.

[4] மலர்மிசை யேகினான் மாணடி சேர்ந்தார்
நிலமிசை நீடுவாழ் வார். (3)

The *Gītā says*:[1] Arjuna! The Lord lives in the heart of all creatures, making all of them move about machine-like by Māyā.

The *Kuraḷ* says:[2]

'The world its course maintains through life that
rain unfailing gives;
Thus rain is known the true ambrosial food of all
that lives.'

The *Bhagavadgītā*[3] furnishes a parallel: Man depends for his existence on food, and the source of foodstuffs is rain.

The *Kuraḷ* says:[4]

'He, who with firmness' curb the five restrains,
Is seed for soil of yonder happy plains.'

The *Gītā*[5] furnishes a parallel: Having restrained the five senses and brought them under control and having fixed one's mind on me, one attains the divine knowledge.

1 ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति ।
भ्रामयन् सर्वभूतानि यन्त्रारूढानि मायया ॥ xviii. 61.

றுலகம் வழங்கி வருதலாற்
றானமிழ்த மென்றுணரற் பாற்று. (11)

3 अन्नाद्भवन्ति भूतानि पर्जन्यादन्नसंभवः ॥

4 உரனென்னுந் தோட்டியா னோரைந்துங் காப்பான்
வரனென்னும் வைப்பிற்கோர் வித்து. (24)

5 तानि सर्वाणि संयम्य युक्त आसीत मत्परः ।
वशे हि यस्येन्द्रियाणि तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ ii. 61.

The *Kuṟaḷ* says:[1]

'Spotless be thou in mind! This only merits virtue's name;
All else, mere pomp of idle sound, no real worth can claim.'

The *Gītā*[2] has the following: Fearlessness, spotless purity, stability of knowledge and *yōga*, gift, peace of mind, sacrifice and learning constitute real *tapas*.

The *Kuṟaḷ says*:[3]

'The men of household virtue, firm in way of good, sustain
The other orders three that rule professed maintain.'

The *Mānavadharmaśāstra*[4] rules to this effect: As the members of the three *āśramas* are maintained by the householder every day by *jñāna* and food, the *āśrama* of the householder is said to be the best.

According to the *Kuṟaḷ*:[5]

'The manes, God, guests, kindred, self, in due degree,
These five to cherish well is chiefest charity.'

1 மனத்துக்கண் மாசில னாத லனைத்தற
னாகுல நீர பிற. (34)

2 अभयं सत्त्वसंशुद्धिर्ज्ञानयोगव्यवस्थितिः ।
दानं दमश्च यज्ञश्च स्वाध्यायस्तप आर्जवम् ॥ xvi. 1.

3 இல்வாழ்வா னென்பா னியல்புடைய மூவர்க்கு
நல்லாற்றி னின்ற துணை. (41)

4 यस्मात् त्रयोऽप्याश्रमिणो ज्ञानेनान्नेन चान्वहम् ।
गृहस्थेनैव धार्यन्ते तस्माज्ज्येष्ठाश्रमो गृही ॥ iii. 78; see also vi. 89.

5 தென்புலத்தார் தெய்வம் விருந்தொக்க றானென்றாங்
கைம்புலத்தா றோம்ப றலை. (43)

In the *Manusmṛti*,[1] he who does not cherish the God, guest, servants, manes and self, is dead though he physically lives.

In the *Kuṛaḷ*:[2]

> 'As doth the house beseem, she shows her wifely dignity;
> As doth her husband's wealth befit, she spends: helpmeet is she.'

The *Dharmaśāstra*[3] has the following idea: A wife should always be joyous, skilled in domestic duties, helpful and economic in expenditure.

In the *Kuṛaḷ*[4] it is said:

> 'There is no lack within the house, where wife in worth excels;
> There is no luck within the house, where wife dishonoured dwells.'

Manu gives expression to similar sentiments[5]: where women are honoured, there the Gods dwell: in the houses where they are not honoured, everything done becomes fruitless.

[1] देवतातिथिभृत्यानां पितृणामात्मनश्च यः ।
न निर्वपति पञ्चानामुच्छ्वसन्न स जीवति ॥ iii. 72.

[2] மனைத்தக்க மாண்புடைய ளாகித்தற் கொண்டான்
வளத்தக்காள் வாழ்க்கைத் துணை. (51)

[3] सदा प्रहृष्टया भाव्यं गृहकार्येषु दक्षया ।
सुसंस्कृतोपस्करया व्यये चामुक्तहस्तया ॥ Manu, v. 150.

[4] இல்லதெ னில்லவள் மாண்பானா லுள்ளதெ
னில்லவள் மாணாக் கடை. (53).

[5] यत्र नार्यस्तु पूज्यन्ते रमन्ते तत्र देवताः ।
यत्रैतास्तु न पूज्यन्ते सर्वास्तत्राफलाः क्रियाः ॥ iii. 56; see also ix. 26.

The *Kuṛaḷ* says:[1]

'Of what avail is watch and ward?
Honour's a woman's safest guard.'

Similar ideas are found in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*:[2] those women who are bound by restraints by her own devoted kinsmen are not truly protected; those who guard themselves are well protected.

The *Kuṛaḷ* says:[3]

'If wife be wholly true to him who gained her as his bride,
Great glory gains she in the world where gods in bliss abide.'

Manu furnishes a parallel:[4] she who will not abuse her rights either by mind, speech or body, attains the world of *pativratas* and is styled *sādhvī* or the good by the righteous.

The *Kuṛaḷ* says:[5]

'Though food of immortality should crown the board,
Feasting alone, the guests without unfed, is thing abhorred.'

1 *சிறைகாக்குங் காப்பெவன் செய்யு மகளிர்*
நிறைகாக்குங் காப்பே தலை. (57)

2 अरक्षिता गृहे रुद्धाः पुरुषैरासकारिभिः ।
आत्मानमात्मना यास्तु रक्षेयुस्ताः सुरक्षिताः ॥ ix. 12.

3 *பெற்றாற் பெறிற்பெறுவர் பெண்டிர் பெருஞ்சிறப்புப்*
புத்தேளிர் வாழு முலகு. (58)

4 पतिं या नाभिचरति मनोवाग्देहसंयता ।
सा भर्तृलोकमाप्नोति सद्भिः साध्वीति चोच्यते ॥ v. 165.

5 *விருந்து புறத்ததாத் தானுண்டல் சாவா*
மருந்தெனினும் வேண்டற்பாற் றன்று. (82)

Similar ideas are found in the *Dharmaśāstra*[1]: A householder is to partake of the food remaining after he has fed the gods, sages, guests, manes, and household deities. He who prepares food for the sake of self, simply eats the sin.

The *Kural*[2] says:

'Pleasant words are words with all-pervading love that burn;
Words from his guileless mouth who can the very truth discern.'

The same ideas occur in *Manusmṛti*.[3] Speak the truth, speak pleasant things. Do not speak unpleasant and false words: speak pleasant and truthful words. This is *sanātana dharma*.

According to the *Kural*:[4]

'Control of self does man conduct to bliss th' immortals share;
Indulgence leads to deepest night, and leaves him there.'

[1] देवानृषीन् मनुष्यांश्च पितॄन् गृह्याश्च देवताः ॥
पूजयित्वा ततः पश्चाद्गृहस्थः शेषभुग्भवेत् ॥ Manu iii. 117.
अघं स केवलं भुङ्क्ते यः पचत्यात्मकारणात् । *Ibid.*, 118.
See also *Ibid*, 106.

[2] இன்சொலா லீர மளை இப் படிறிலவாஞ்
செம்பொருள் கண்டார்வாய்ச் சொல். (91)

[3] सत्यं ब्रूयात् प्रियं ब्रूयान्न ब्रूयात् सत्यमप्रियम् ।
प्रियं च नानृतं ब्रूयादेष धर्मः सनातनः ॥ iv. 138.

[4] அடக்க மமரரு ளுய்க்கு மடங்காமை
யாரிரு ளுய்த்து விடும். (121)

Manu says[1] that indulgence of sense organs leads to evil without doubt: having controlled them, one attains salvation.

Again the *Kuṛaḷ* rules:[2]

''Though he forget, the Brahman may regain his Vēdic lore;
Failing in "decorum due," birthright's gone for evermore.'

In the laws of Manu,[3] it is said that a Brahman who is devoid of decorum will not attain the fruits of the study of the Vēdas. On the other hand, one who observes decorum will reap the full reward.

The *Kuṛaḷ* prescribes:[4]

'How great soe'er they be, what gain have they of life,
Who, not a whit reflecting, seek a neighbour's wife?'

Manu's remarks[5] are appropriate: There is no other thing which results in diminution of life than the fact of a person's criminal intimacy with his neighbour's wife.

1 इन्द्रियाणां प्रसङ्गेन दोषमृच्छत्यसंशयम् ।
संनियम्य तु तान्येव ततः सिद्धिं नियच्छति । ii. 93.

2 மறப்பினு மோத்துக் கொளலாகும் பார்ப்பான்
பிறப்பொழுக்கங் குன்றக் கெடும். (134)

3 आचाराद्विच्युतो विप्रो न वेदफलमश्नुते ।
आचारेण तु संयुक्तः संपूर्णफलभाग्भवेत् ॥ i. 109.

4 எனைத்துணைய ராயினு மென்னாந் தினைத்துணையுந்
தேரான் பிறனில் புகல். (144)

5 न हीदृशमनायुष्यं लोके किञ्चन विद्यते ।
यादृशं पुरुषस्येह परदारोपसेवनम् ॥ iv. 134.

In the *Kuraḷ*:[1]

'Like tortoise, who the five restrains
In one, through seven worlds bliss obtains.'

The *Bhagavadgītā* says[2] that as a tortoise will restrain all limbs into itself, he who would restrain his senses willl attain wisdom.

The *Kuraḷ* rules:[3]

'Let men relieve the wasting hunger men endure;
For treasure gained thus finds he treasure-house
secure.'

The *Mānavadharmaśāstra*[4] rules to this effect: One must not eat oneself without feeding first the guest; Feeding of the guests leads to wealth, health, fame and heaven.

The *Kuraḷ*[5] asks:

'We eat the slain' you say, 'by us no living creatures die';
Who'd kill and sell, I pray, if none came there the flesh to buy?

1 ஒருமையு ளாமைபோ லைந்தடக்க லாற்றி
னெழுமையு மேமாப் புடைத்து. (126)

2 यदा संहरते चायं कूर्मोऽङ्गानीव सर्वशः ।।
इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेभ्यस्तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ।। ii. 53.

3 அற்றா ரழிபசி தீர்த்த லஃதொருவன்
பெற்றான் பொருள்வைப் புழி. (226)

4 न वै स्वयं तदश्नीयादतिथिं यन्न भोजयेत् ।
धन्यं यशस्यमायुष्यं स्वर्ग्यं वातिथिपूजनम् ।। i.i. 106.

5 தினற்பொருட்டாற் கொல்லா துலகெனின் யாரும்
விலைப்பொருட்டா லூன்றருவா ரில். (256)

Manu says:[1] He who approves of the killing of an animal, who preserves the slaughtered body, who kills it, who buys it and sells it, who cooks it, and who serves it, and who makes a meal of it are to be termed 'killers'.

The *Kuṟaḷ* says:[2]

'With other beings' ulcerous wounds their hunger may appease;
If this they felt, desire to eat must surely cease.'

According to Manu,[3] having learnt the origin of flesh (meat) and the killing of creatures, one will refrain from taking any kind of meat.

The *Kuṟaḷ* prescribes:[4]

'Than thousand rich oblations, with libations rare,
Better the flesh of slaughtered beings not to share.'

Manu's ruling[5] is similar: he who would perform a hundred *Aśvamēdha* sacrifices year after year and he who would refrain from flesh-eating are equal so far the attainment of fruits is concerned.

[1] अनुमन्ता विशसिता निहन्ता क्रयविक्रयी ।
संस्कर्ता चोपहर्ता च खादकश्चेति घातकाः ॥ v. 51.

[2] உண்ணாமை வேண்டும் புலா அல் பிறிதொன்றன்
புண்ண துணர்வார்ப் பெறின். (257)

[3] समुत्पत्तिं च मांसस्य वधबन्धौ च देहिनाम् ।
प्रसमीक्ष्य निवर्तेत सर्वमांसस्य भक्षणात् ॥ v. 49, *ibid.* 52.

[4] அவிசொரிந் தாயிரம் வேட்டலி னொன்ற
னுயிர்செகுத் துண்ணாமை நன்று. (259)

[5] वर्षे वर्षेऽश्वमेधेन यो यजेत शतं समाः ।
मांसानि च न खादेद्यस्तयोः पुण्यफलं समम् ॥ v. 53.

The *Kuṛal*[1] says:

'Who gains himself in utter self-control,
Him worships every other living soul.'

In Manu,[2] one should endeavour day and night to conquer the senses; and one who conquers his senses is able to have all people under his control.

In the *Kuṛaḷ*:[3]

'Every lamp is not a lamp in wise men's sight:
That 's the lamp with truth's pure radiance bright.'

In the *Gītā*:[4] The Yōgi controlled, self engaged, in meditation, is likened to a lamp that is still in a windless place.

According to Vaḷḷuvar:[5]

'Who had a loathed life in bodies sorely pained,
Are men, the wise declare, by guilt of slaughter stained.'

In the laws of Manu[6] it is said that he who causes the killing of prohibited animals for his own happiness,

1 தன்னுயிர் தானறப் பெற்றானை யேனைய
மன்னுயி ரெல்லாந் தொழும். (268)

2 इन्द्रियाणां जये योगं समातिष्ठेद्दिवानिशम् ।
जितेन्द्रियो हि शक्नोति वशे स्थापयितुं प्रजाः ॥ vii. 44.

3 எல்லா விளக்கும் விளக்கல்ல சான்றோர்க்குப்
பொய்யா விளக்கே விளக்கு. (299)

4 यथा दीपो निवातस्थो नेङ्गते सोपमा स्मृता ।
योगिनो यतचित्तस्य युञ्जतो योगमात्मनः ॥ vi. 19.

5 உயிருடம்பி னீக்கியா ரென்ப செயிருடம்பிற்
செல்லாத்தீ வாழ்க்கை யவர். (330)

6 योऽहिंसकानि भूतानि हिनस्त्यात्मसुखेच्छया ।
स जीवंच मृतश्चैव न क्वचित् सुखमेधते ॥ v. 45.

is considered to be dead, though living, for he never attains happiness.

Vaḷḷuvar says:[1]

'Death is sinking into slumbers deep;
Birth again is waking out of sleep.'

The *Bhagavadgītā*[2] furnishes a parallel: There is certain death to one who is born, and there is certain birth to one dead.

Book II. PORUṬPĀL

Parimēlaḻagar makes a three-fold classification of the second section of the *Kuṟaḷ*. He divides it into kingship,[3] elements of sovereignty[4] and common duties.[5] This section consists of seventy chapters on the whole; and of these, twenty-five chapters deal with kingship and king. The next ten chapters ending with the title *avaiañjāmai* deal with the ministry. Chapters 74-8 are devoted to *Poruḷ* according to one view, while the succeeding five chapters are concerned with friendship. Twelve chapters from the eighty-fourth chapter come according to the same authority, under the category of *tuṉbaviyal*.[6]

The *Kuṟaḷ* says:[7]

'An army, people, wealth, a minister, friends, fort:
six things—
Who owns them all, a lion lives amid the kings.'

[1] உறங்குவது போலுஞ் சாக்கா டுறங்கி
விழிப்பது போலும் பிறப்பு. (339)

[2] जातस्य हि ध्रुवो मृत्युः ध्रुवं जन्म मृतस्य च ।
तस्मात् अपरिहार्येऽर्थे न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥ Cf. Manu. VI. 63.

[3] அரசியல். [4] அங்கவியல். [5] ஒழிபியல்.

[6] See *Sen Tamil*, vol. i, p. 245.

[7] படைகுடி கூழமைச்சு நட்பரண் ஆறு
முடையா னரசரு ளேறு. (381)

The *Arthaśāstra*[1] prescribes: the king, minister, territory, fort, treasury, army, friends constitute the elements of a State. . . . He who possesses these and who follows the righteous policy is able to conquer the whole earth and is never defeated.

According to the *Kuṛaḷ*[2]

'A king is he who treasure gains, stores up, defends,
And duly for his kingdom's weal expends.'

The *Kāmandaka nītisāra*[3] furnishes a parallel:

The four-fold functions of the king are to acquire wealth by equitable means, to preserve it, to augment it and then expend it on the deserving.

What the *Kuṛaḷ*[4] prescribes:

'Gifts, grace, right sceptre, care of people's weal:
These four a light of dreaded kings reveal.'

is corroborated by the *Kāmandakī*:[5]

Pleasant speech, grace, gifts, protection of the poor

[1] स्वाम्यमात्यजनपददुर्गकोशदण्डमित्राणि प्रकृतयः ।
आत्मवांस्त्वल्पदेशोऽपि युक्तः प्रकृतिसंपदा ।
नयज्ञः पृथिवीं कृत्स्नां जयत्येव न हीयते ॥
Bk. vi. 1. cf. *Kāmandaka*. i. 18.

[2] இயற்றலு மீட்டலுங் காத்தலுங் காத்த
வகுத்தலும் வல்ல தரசு. (385)

[3] न्यायेनार्जनमर्थस्य रक्षणं वर्धनं तथा ।
सत्पात्रप्रतिपत्तिश्च राजवृत्तं चतुर्विधम् ॥ i. 20.

[4] கொடையளி செங்கோல் குடியோம்ப னான்கு
முடையானாம் வேந்தர்க் கொளி. (390)

[5] वाक् सूनृता दया दानं दीनोपगतरक्षणम् ।
इति सङ्गः सतां साधु हितं सत्पुरुषव्रतम् ॥ iii. 2.

and the distressed, and association with men of character are recognized by the world as the right thing.

The prescription of the *Kuṛaḷ* is:[1]

'So learn that you may full and faultless learning
gain,
Then in obedience meet to lessons learnt
remain.'

According to the *Arthaśāstra*,[2] sciences should be studied under qualified teachers and their precepts duly followed. . . . Discipline is the fruit of learning.

In the *Kuṛaḷ*[3] it is said:

'Wealth of wealth is wealth acquired by ear
attent:
Wealth mid all wealth supremely excellent.'

The *Kauṭalīya*[4] says: Hearing opens the door to knowledge, knowledge to right action, and right action to knowledge of one's self. This is what constitutes *vidyā*.

[1] கற்க கசடறக் கற்பவை கற்றபி
னிற்க வதற்குத் தக. (391)

[2] विद्यानां तु यथास्वमाचार्यप्रामाण्याद्विनयो नियमश्च ।
विद्या विनयति ... ॥ Bk. i. 5.

[3] செல்வத்துட் செல்வஞ் செவிச்செல்வ மச்செல்வஞ்
செல்வத்து ளெல்லாந் தலை. (411)

[4] श्रुताद्धि प्रज्ञोपजायते प्रज्ञया योगो योगादात्मवत्तेति विद्यासामर्थ्यम् ॥
Bk. i, ch. v.

The *Kuṛaḷ*[1] says:

'The wise discern, the foolish fail to see,
And minds prepare for things about to be.'

In the *Arthaśāstra*,[2] he who possesses the eye of knowledge and science, is able to discern the true thing with a little effort.

According to the *Kuṛaḷ*:[3]

'As friends the men who virtue know, and riper wisdom share,
Their worth weighed well, the king should choose with care.'

The prescription of Bhāradvāja[4] is that companions whose honesty and skill have been put to satisfactory tests shall be appointed ministers.

The *Kuṛaḷ*[5] asks:

'What power can work his fall, who faithful ministers,
Employs, that thunder out reproaches when he errs.'

[1] அறிவுடையா ராவ தறிவா ரறிவிலா
ரஃதறி கல்லா தவர். (427)

[2] प्रज्ञाशास्त्रचक्षुर्हि राजा अल्पेनापि प्रयत्नेन मन्त्रमाधातुं शक्तः ।
Bk. ix, ch. i.

[3] அறனறிந்து மூத்த வறிவுடையார் கேண்மை
திறனறிந்து தேர்ந்து கொளல். (441)

[4] सहायाध्यायिनोऽमात्यान् कुर्वीत दृष्टशौचसामर्थ्यत्वात् इति भारद्वाजः ।
Ar. Śās. Bk. i. 8.

[5] இடிக்குந் துணையாரை யாள்வாரை யாரே
கெடுக்குந் தகைமை யவர். (447)

The *Arthaśāstra*[1] prescribes that a king should select such ministers whose loyalty has been tried and who would protect him from risks involving danger to life.

The *Kuṟaḷ*[2] prescribes:

> 'With chosen friends deliberate; next use thy private thought;
> Then act. By those who thus proceed all works with ease are wrought.'
>
> 'Plan and perform no work that others may despise;
> What misbeseems a king the world will not approve as wise.'

The *Arthaśāstra*[3] says: All undertakings are to be preceded by *mantra* or counsel. . . . Let the king review the works with the ministers present. . . . That which gives fruition and is advocated by the best men must be done.

It is the opinion of Vaḷḷuvar:[4]

> 'The force the strife demands, the force he owns, the force of foes,
> The force of friends: these should he weigh ere to the war he goes.'

[1] य एनमापत्सु प्राणाबाधयुक्तास्वनुग्रहीयुः
तानमात्यान् कुर्वीत । इष्टानुरागत्वादिति ॥ Bk. i. 8.

[2] தெரிந்த வினத்தொடு தேர்ந்தெண்ணிச் செய்வார்க்
கரும்பொருள் யாதொன்று மில். (462)
எள்ளாத வெண்ணிச் செயல்வேண்டுந் தம்மொடு
கொள்ளாத கொள்ளா துலகு. (470)

[3] मन्त्रापूर्वाः सर्वारम्भाः । ...... आसन्नैः सह कार्याणि पश्येत् ।
...... तत्र यद्भूयिष्ठाः कार्यसिद्धिकरं वा ब्रूयुः तत्कुर्यात् ।
Bk. i. 15.

[4] வினைவலியுந் தன்வலியு மாற்றான் வலியுந்
துணைவலியுந் தூக்கிச் செயல். (471)

On this Kautalya[1] observes: The conquering monarch shall acquaint himself with the comparative strength and weakness, of himself and of his enemy in regard to power, place, time, season for march. season for recruiting the army, consequential advantages and difficulties arising from anger, diminution and loss, and decide on expedition if he would feel assured of superiority in his force.

The title of the Chapter XLVIII in the *Kuṟaḷ,* viz., வலியறிதல் equates with शक्तिज्ञानम् of the *Kauṭalīya,* Bk. ix, ch. i.

The *Kuṟaḷ*[2] asks:

'Who know what can be wrought, with knowledge of the means, on this
Their mind firm set, go forth, nought goes with them amiss. (472)
'Who daring climbs, and would himself upraise
Beyond the branch's tip, with life the forfeit pays. (476)
'With knowledge of the measure due, as virtue bids you, give!
That is the way to guard your wealth, and seemly live.' (477)

[1] विजिगीषुरात्मनः परस्य च बलाबलं शक्तिदेशकालयात्राकालबलसमुत्थानकालपश्चात्कोपक्षयव्ययलाभापदां ज्ञात्वा विशिष्टबलो यायात् ।

Bk. ix, ch. i.

[2] ஒல்வ தறிவ தறிந்ததன் கட்டங்கிச்
செல்வார்க்குச் செல்லாத தில். (472)
நுனிக்கொம்ப ரேறினா ரஃதிறந் தூக்கி
னுயிர்க்கிறுதி யாகி விடும். (476)
ஆற்றி னளவறிந் தீக வதுபொருள்
போற்றி வழங்கு நெறி. (477)

The *Kauṭalīya*[1] says: The power of *mantra* is better. The king who possesses the eye of śāstraic knowledge can press his knowledge into service even with little effort. He can over-reach the enemy with enthusiasm and power by means of conciliation, and application of strategic means. In this way success is due to enthusiasm, power and force of *mantra* in the ascending order.

The title of the Chapter XLIX of the *Kuṛaḷ*, கால மறிதல் corresponds to the कालज्ञान of the *Kauṭalīya*, Bk. ix, ch. i..

According to the author of the *Kuṛaḷ*:[2]

'A crow will conquer owl in broad daylight;
The king that foes would crush, needs fitting time to fight.
'The bond binds fortune fast is ordered effort made
Strictly observant still of favouring season's aid.'

Says the *Kauṭalīya*:[3] That season is best which is suited to the manoeuvre of one's own army and unsuited

[1] मन्त्रशक्तिः श्रेयसी । प्रज्ञाशास्त्रचक्षुर्हि राजा अल्पेनापि प्रयत्नेन मन्त्रमाधातुं शक्तः । परानुत्साहप्रभाववतश्च सामादिभिर्योगोपनिषद्भ्यां चातिसंधातुम् । एवमुत्साह-प्रभावमन्त्रशक्तीनामुत्तरोत्तराधिकोऽतिसन्धत्ते ।
Bk. ix, ch. i.

[2] *பகல்வெல்லுங் கூகையைக் காக்கை யிகல்வெல்லும்*
வேந்தர்க்கு வேண்டும் பொழுது. (481)
பருவத்தோ டொட்ட வொழுக றிருவினைத்
தீராமை யார்க்குங் கயிறு. (482)

[3] यत्रात्मनः सैन्यव्यायामानामृतुः अनृतः परस्य स उत्तमः कालः ।
विपरीतोऽधमः । साधारणो मध्यमः ।
'कालश्रेयान्' इत्येके—'दिवा काकः कौशिकं हन्ति, रात्रौ कौशिकः काकम्' इति ।
Bk. ix, ch. i.

to one's enemy. The reverse is the worst. The ordinary season is the middling one.

'Time alone is better' say some. For on this account the crow kills the owl in the day and the owl the crow in the night.

The title of the Chapter (L) in the *Kuṛaḷ* இடனறிதல் is a translation of the term देशज्ञान of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* Bk. ix, ch. i.

The *Kuṛaḷ*[1] prescribes:

'E' en weak ones mightily prevail, if place of strong
  defence
They find, protect themselves, and work their
  foes offence.
'The foes who thought to triumph, find their
  thoughts were vain,
If hosts advance, seize vantage ground, and
  thence the fight maintain.'

According to the *Arthaśāstra*[2] 'one should endeavour the means to increase the strength of one's own force. That *dēśa* is the best which is the ground for the manoeuvre of one's own army but disadvantageous to the enemy. Otherwise it is the worst. That which is common is neither best nor worst.'

[1] ஆற்ருரு மாற்றி யடுப விடனறிந்து
போற்ருர்கட் போற்றிச் செயின். (493)
எண்ணியா ரெண்ண மிழப்ப ரிடனறிந்து
துன்னியார் துன்னிச் செயின். (494)

[2] यथास्वबलवृद्धिकरं कर्म प्रयुञ्जीत, यत्रात्मनः सैन्यव्यायामानां भूमिः अभूमिः परस्य, स उत्तमो देशः, विपरीतोऽधमः, साधारणो मध्यमः ।
Bk. ix. ch. 1.

According to the *Kuṟaḷ*:[1]

'The crocodile prevails in its own flow of water wide,
If this it leaves, 'tis slain by any thing beside.'
'Save their own fearless might they need no other aid,
If in right place they fight, all due provision made.'
'The jackal slays, in miry paths of foot-betraying fen,
The elephant of fearless eye and tusks transfixing armed men.'

In the *Arthaśāstra*[2] it is said:

'The ground is better,' some say. On this account the dog on the ground can overreach even a crocodile, and the crocodile in the low ground the dog.

Thus we come across similar ideas both in the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Kuṟaḷ*. While the *Arthaśāstra* has dealt in one chapter all the three means of *śakti*[3], *dēśa*[4] and *kāla*,[5] the *Kuṟaḷ* devotes three separate chapters of ten *kuṟaḷ-veṇbās* each.

The Chapters LI and LII of the *Kuṟaḷ* entitled 'தெரிந்து தெளிதல்' and 'தெரிந்து வினையாடல்' are identical with a chapter in the *Arthaśāstra* उपधाभिः शौचाशौचज्ञानममात्यानाम् । (Bk. i, 10).

1 நெடும்புனலுள் வெல்லு முதலை யடும்புனலி
னீங்கி னதனைப் பிற. (495)
அஞ்சாமை யல்லாற் றுணைவேண்டா வெஞ்சாமை
யெண்ணி யிடத்தாற் செயின். (497)
காலாழ் களரி னரியடுங் கண்ணஞ்சா
வேலாண் முகத்த களிறு. (500)

2 'देशः श्रेयान्' इत्येके—स्थलगतो हि श्वानक्रं विकर्षति । निम्नगतो नक्रः श्वानमिति | Bk. ix. ch. 1.

3 வலி. 4 இடம். 5 காலம்.

According to the *Kuṟaḷ*:[1]

'How treats he virtue, wealth and pleasure? How, when life's at stake,
Comports himself? This four-fold test of man will full assurance make.'

Says Kauṭalya:[2] The ministers shall be tested by the *upadhās* which are in the nature of temptations. These are of four kinds, the temptation of virtue, wealth, lust and fear.

The *Kuṟaḷ*[3] has the following:

'*Trust* where you have not tried, *doubt* of a friend to feel,
Once trusted, wounds inflict that nought can heal.'

The *Arthaśāstra*[4] says: The *ācāryas* have prescribed that the king should appoint government servants in their respective posts after the four-fold test and according to the satisfaction afforded by such test.

1 அறம்பொரு ளின்ப முயிரச்ச நான்கின்
திறந்தெரிந்து தேறப் படும் (501)

2 अमात्यानुपधाभिः शौचयेत् । धर्मोपधा, अर्थोपधा, कामोपधा, भयोपधा !
Bk. i, ch. 10.

3 தேரான் றெளிவுந் தெளிந்தான்க ணையுறவுந்
தீரா விடும்பை தரும். (510)

I render this *Kuṟaḷ veṇbā* thus: 'Having put one to the four-fold-test of dharma, wealth, pleasure and fear, a selection must be made.' There is a learned gloss of Parimēlaḻagar on this:[4]

4 त्रिवर्गभयसंशुद्धानमात्यान् स्वेषु कर्मसु ।
अधिकुर्याद्यथाशौचमित्याचार्या व्यवस्थिताः ॥ Bk. i, ch. 10.

What the *Kuṟaḷ*[1] rules:

'As each man's special aptitude is known,
Bid each man make that special work his own.'
'Let king search out his servants' deeds each day;
When these do right, the world goes rightly on
 its way'

is corroborated by the *Kauṭalīya*.[2]

Those who have come out successful from the *dharmōpadhā* are to be appointed as judges and commissioners, from the *arthōpadhā* to offices of treasurer and collector-general, from the *kāmōpadhā* to guarding frontiers, harem and sporting grounds, and from the *bhayōpadhā* in the king's household.

Those who have gone through the four ordeals are to be chosen as ministers.

Having thus chosen his servants by the four-fold tests, the king shall endeavour through his spies to get at their loyalty or otherwise.

[1] *வினைக்குரிமை நாடிய*
யதற்குரிய னாகச் செயல். (518)
நாடோறு நாடுக மன்னன் வினைசெய்வான்
கோடாமை கோடா துலகு. (520)

[2] तत्र धर्मोपधाशुद्धान् धर्मस्थीयकण्टकशोधनेषु स्थापयेत् ।
अर्थोपधाशुद्धान् समाहर्तृसन्निधातृनिचयकर्मसु ।
कामोपधाशुद्धान् बाह्याभ्यन्तरविहाररक्षासु ।
भयोपधाशुद्धान् आसन्नकार्येषु राज्ञः ।
सर्वोपधाशुद्धान् मन्त्रिणः कुर्यात् ।...
तस्माद्बाह्यमधिष्ठानं कृत्वा कार्ये चतुर्विधे ।
शौचाशौचममात्यानां राजा मार्गेत सत्रिभिः ॥ Bk. i, ch. x.

The ruling of the *Kural*[1] is as follows:

"This man, this work shalt thus work out", let thoughtful king command;
Then leave the matter wholly in his servant's hand.

Kāmandaka says:[2]

He whose capacity is too well known for a particular job is appointed to it, just like the different senses which are employed to perceive particular objects.

To the *Kural*:[3]

'Search out, to no one favour show, with heart that justice loves,
Consult, then act; this is the rule that right approves,'

the *Rāmāyaṇa*[4] furnishes a parallel: If the punishment accorded to the offenders is meted out according to the laws of the land, it leads the monarch to heaven.

The *Kural*[5] observes:

'Learning and virtue of the sages spring,
From all-controlling sceptre of the king.'

[1] இதனை யிதனா லிவன்முடிக்கு மென்றாய்ந்
ததனை யவன்கண் விடல். (517)

[2] यो यद्वस्तु विजानाति तं तत्र विनियोजयेत् ।
अशेषविषयप्राप्ताविन्द्रियार्थेष्विवेन्द्रियम् ॥ v. 75.

[3] ஓர்ந்துகண் ணோடா திறைபுரிந் தியார்மாட்டுந்
தேர்ந்துசெய் வஃதே முறை. (541)

[4] अपराधिषु यो दण्डः पात्यते मानवेषु वै ।
स दण्डो विधिवन्मुक्तः स्वर्गं नयति पार्थिवम् ॥ vii. 79. 9.

Cf. *Āpastamba* ii. 5, ii. 3

सुविचितं विचित्या दैवप्रश्नेभ्यो राजा दण्डाय प्रतिपद्यते ।

[5] அந்தணர் நூற்கு மறத்திற்கு மாதியாய்
நின்றது மன்னவன் கோல். (543)

According to the *Arthaśāstra*:[1]

That state which is disciplined by the established laws of the Aryas, which is rooted in the organization of castes and orders, and which is protected by the three Vēdas, progresses and never deteriorates.

To the *Kuṟaḷ*:[2]

'Where king, who righteous law regards, the sceptre wields,
There fall the showers, there rich abundance crowns the fields,'

a parallel is furnished in the *Rāmāyaṇa*:[3]

The fields are rich with crops, the rains shower in proper seasons, and the soldiers are free from disease during Śatrughna's rule.

Similar to the *Kuṟaḷ*:[4]

'Whose rod from right deflects, who counsel doth refuse,
At once his wealth and people utterly shall lose,'

the lawgiver rules:

That king who allows the kingdom to deteriorate owing to sheer neglect and lethargy will soon fall from his position and life with all his relatives.[5]

[1] व्यवस्थितार्यमर्यादः कृतवर्णाश्रमस्थितिः ।
त्रय्या हि रक्षितो लोकः प्रसीदति न सीदति ॥ Bk. i. 3.

[2] இயல்புளிக் கோலோச்சு மன்னவ னாட்ட
பெயலும் விளையுளுந் தொக்கு. (545)

[3] क्षेत्राणि सस्ययुक्तानि काले वर्षति वासवः ।
अरोगवीरपुरुषा शत्रुघ्नभुजपालिता ॥ vii. 70. 10.

[4] கூழுங் குடியு மொருங்கிழக்குங் கோல்கோடிச்
சூழாது செய்யு மரசு. (554)

[5] मोहाद्राजा स्वराष्ट्रं यः कर्षयत्यनवेक्षया ।
सोऽचिरात् भ्रश्यते राज्याज्जीविताच्च सबान्धवः ॥ Manu, vii. 111.

To the *Kuṛaḷ*:[1]

'Where guardian guardeth not, udder of kine grows dry,
And Brahman's sacred lore will all forgotten lie,'

the *Mahābhārata*[2] furnishes a parallel:

When *daṇḍanīti* is given a death-blow and when the ancient *rājadharma* of the *kṣatriyas* becomes lost, the sacred lore gets extinct, as also all the *dharmas* including those *dharmas* pertaining to the *āśramas*.

To the ruling of the *Kuṛaḷ*:[3]

'For length of days with still increasing joys on heaven who call,
Should raise the rod with bow severe, but let it gently fall.'

Manu[4] furnishes a parallel:

The king should be harsh and mild according to the nature of the work. He endears himself to the people, being harsh and soft.

The *Kuṛaḷ* says:[5]

'Who builds no fort whence he may foe defy,
In time of war shall fear and swiftly die.'

[1] ஆபயன் குன்று மறுதொழிலோர் நூன்மறப்பர்
காவலன் காவா னெனின். (560)

[2] मज्जे त्रयी दण्डनीतौ हतायां
सर्वे धर्माः प्रत्ययेयुर्विरुद्धाः ।
सर्वे धर्माश्चाश्रमाणां हताः स्युः
क्षात्रे नष्टे राजधर्मे पुराणे ॥ Śānti. ch. 112. 28.

[3] கடிதோச்சி மெல்ல வெறிக நெடிதாக்க
நீங்காமை வேண்டு பவர். (562)

[4] तीक्ष्णश्चैव मृदुश्च स्यात् कार्यं वीक्ष्य महीपतिः ।
तीक्ष्णश्चैव मृदुश्चैव राजा भवति संमतः ॥ vii. 140.

[5] செருவந்த போழ்திற் சிறைசெய்யா வேந்தன்
வெருவந்து வெய்து கெடும். (569)

Manu[1] gives expression to similar sentiments:

The enemies do not wrong those resident in fortresses, as they do not attack the king who shelters under a fort.

The Chapter LIX in the *Kuṟaḷ* entitled ஒற்றாடல் can be equated with the title गूढपुरुषोत्पत्तिः the eleventh chapter of Book I of the *Arthaśāstra*. While the latter prescribes sending *cāras* to the eighteen departments of the State as well as the enemy, the friend and the neutral, the *Kuṟaḷ* chapter is apparently concerned with the enemy, the neutral and the ally.

In the *Kuṟaḷ*[2] it is said:

'As monk or devotee, through every hindrance making way,
A spy, whate'er men do, must watchful mind display.
A spy must search each hidden matter out,
And full report must render, free from doubt.
Spying by spies, the things they tell,
To test by other spies is well.
One spy must not another see: contrive it so;
And things by three confirmed as truth you know.'

[1] यथा दुर्गाश्रितानेतान्नोपहिंसन्ति शत्रवः ।
तथारयो न हिंसन्ति नृपं दुर्गसमाश्रितम् ॥ Manu vii. 73.

[2] துறந்தார் படிவத்த ராகி யிறந்தாராய்ந்
தென்செயினுஞ் சோர்வில தொற்று. (586)
மறைந்தவை கேட்கவற் றாகி யறிந்தவை
யையப்பா டில்லதே யொற்று. (587)
ஒற்றொற்றித் தந்த பொருளையு மற்றுமோ
ரொற்றினா லொற்றிக் கொளல். (588)
ஒற்றொற் றுணராமை யாள்க வுடன்மூவர்
சொற்றொக்க தேறப் படும். (589)

The *Arthaśāstra*[1] has the following:—

The king shall send fraudulent and ascetic spies who have been tried for their loyalty and skill.

The class of officers who went by the name of *tīkṣaṇas* ascertained their outward conduct. The *satri* spies carried this information to the district quarters. The residential officers therein made it known to the head-quarters through signs and cipher writings. This is to be done without the knowledge of the respective *saṃsthās*. If the information is corroborated by three independent sources, it is taken to be confirmed.

In the *Kuṛaḷ*[2]:

'These two: the code renowned, and spies,
In these let king confide as eyes.'

The *Kāmandakī*[3] says:

A king should get at the movements of the adversary through the medium of his cautious and secret spies. That king one of whose eyes is *cāra* or the spy is awake even in sleep.

[1] कापटिक, तापसव्यञ्जनान् + + + भक्तितः सामर्थ्ययोगाच्चापसर्पयेत् ।
तेषां बाह्यं चारम् + + तीक्ष्णा विद्युः ।
तं सत्रिणः संस्थास्वर्पयेयुः ।
संस्थानामन्तेवासिनः संज्ञालिपिभिश्चारसञ्चारं कुर्युः ।
न चान्योन्यं संस्थास्ते वा विद्युः ।
त्रयाणामेकवाक्ये सम्प्रत्ययः । *Ar. Śās.*, Bk. i, ch. 11 and 12.

[2] ஒற்று முறைசான்ற நூலு மிவையிரண்டுந்
தெற்றென்க மன்னவன் கண். (581)

[3] सूक्ष्मसूत्रप्रचारेण पश्येद्वैरिविचेष्टितम् ।
स्वपन्नपि हि जागर्ति चारचक्षुर्महीपतिः ॥ xiii. 29.

According to the *Kuṛaḷ*:[1]

'Let indolence, the death of effort, die,
If you'd uphold your household's dignity.
His family decays, and faults unheeded thrive,
Who, sunk in sloth, for noble objects doth not strive.'

The *Gītā*[2] gives similar ideas:

Know, oh Bhārata, inertia born of ignorance and the deluder of all beings, is bound by sloth, indolence and sleep.

The *Kuṛaḷ*[3] says:

'He seeks not joy, to sorrow man is born, he knows;
Such man will walk unharmed by touch of human woes.
Who pain as pleasure takes, he shall acquire
The bliss to which his foes in vain aspire.'

[1] மடியை மடியா வொழுகல் குடியைக்
குடியாக வேண்டு பவர். (602)
குடிமடிந்து குற்றம் பெருகு மடிமடிந்து
மாண்ட வுஞற்றி லவர்க்கு. (604)

[2] तमस्त्वज्ञानजं विद्धि मोहनं सर्वदेहिनाम् ।
प्रमादालस्यनिद्राभिस्तन्निबध्नाति भारत ॥

Gītā xiv. 8.

[3] இன்பம் விழையா னிடும்பை யியல்பென்பான்
றுன்ப முறுத லிலன். (628)
இன்னாமை யின்ப மெனக்கொளி னாகுந்தன்
னொன்னார் விழையுஞ் சிறப்பு. (630)

The *Gītā*[1] says similarly:

You grieve for things not fit to be grieved for and yet indulge in wise sayings. The wise never grieve either for the living or for the dead.

He who sees his self in everything and looks upon pleasure and pain equally, is a perfect Yōgī.

The *Kuṟaḷ*[2] defines the minister thus:

'A minister is he who grasps, with wisdom large,
Means, time, work's mode and functions rare he must discharge.'

The *Arthaśāstra*[3] says 'the ministers shall engage in the following five duties: commencing a work, finding out resources, fixing it according to place and time, protecting against possible dangers, and final consummation.

The *Kuṟaḷ*[4] prescribes:

'Speaking out your speech, when once 'tis past dispute
That none can utter speech that shall your speech refute.
Charming each hearer's ear, of others' words to seize the sense,
Is method wise of men of spotless excellence.'

1 अशोच्यानन्वशोचस्त्वं प्रज्ञावादांश्च भाषसे ।
गतासूनगतासूंश्च नानुशोचन्ति पण्डिताः ॥ ii. 11.
आत्मौपम्येन सर्वत्र समं पश्यति योऽर्जुन ।
सुखं वा यदि वा दुःखं स योगी परमो मतः ॥ vi 32.

2 கருவியுங் காலமுஞ் செய்கையுஞ் செய்யு
மருவினையு மாண்ட தமைச்சு. (631)

3 अकृतारम्भमारब्धानुष्ठानमनुष्ठितविशेषं नियोगसम्पदं च कर्मणां कुर्युः ।
Bk. i. 15.

4 சொல்லுக சொல்லைப் பிறிதோர்சொ லச்சொல்லை
வெல்லுஞ்சொ லின்மை யறிந்து. (645)
வேட்பத்தாஞ் சொல்லிப் பிறர்சொற் பயன்கோடன்
மாட்சியின் மாசற்றார் கோள். (646)

A good illustration of this maxim is found in the *Mahābhārata*.[1] Here when the kingdom is threatened with an invasion, the king goes to the country and begs for war loans and benevolences by speaking out in sweet, soft and convincing style.

What the *Kuṟaḷ*[2] says:

'Though toil and trouble face thee, firm resolve hold fast,
And do the deeds that pleasure yield at last.
The world desires not men of every power possessed,
Who powers in act desire not, crown of all the rest',

is expressed in other words by the *Bhagavadgītā*:[3]

'Do not get vexed. This is unbecoming of one like yourself. Give up the detestable weakness of the heart and gird up, oh slayer of foes.'

[1] प्रागेव तु धनादानमनुभाष्य ततः पुनः ।
सन्निपत्य स्वविषये भयं राष्ट्रे प्रदर्शयेत् ॥
इति वाचा मधुरया श्लक्ष्णया सोपचारया ।
स्वरश्मीनभ्यवसृजेद्योगमाधाय कालवित् ॥ Sānti, 88, 26, 34.

[2] துன்ப முறவரினுஞ் செய்க துணிவாற்றி
யின்பம் பயக்கும் வினை. (669)
எனைத்திட்ப மெய்தியக் கண்ணும் வினைத்திட்பம்
வேண்டாரை வேண்டா துலகு. (670)

[3] क्लैब्यं मा स्म गमः पार्थ नैतत्त्वय्युपपद्यते ।
क्षुद्रं हृदयदौर्बल्यं त्यक्त्वोत्तिष्ठ परन्तप । ii. 3, cp. iv. 20,

The prescription of the *Kuṛaḷ*[1] is as follows:

'Benevolence, high birth, the courtesy kings love:—
These qualities the envoy of a king approve.
Love, knowledge, power of chosen words, three things,
Should he possess who speaks the words of kings.
Mighty in lore amongst the learned must he be,
Midst jav'lin-bearing kings who speaks the words of victory.
Sense, goodly grace, and knowledge exquisite,
Who hath these three for envoy's task is fit.'

Similar ideas are expressed by the law-giver:[2]

The king shall appoint him an ambassador who is versed in all sciences, who can read the gestures and signs, pure, skilled, of noble family.

That ambassador, who is loyal, honest, intelligent of excellent memory, who acts according to time and place, of good physique, bold and possessed of good powers of speech is applauded.

[1] அன்புடைமை யான்ற குடிப்பிறத்தல் வேந்தவாம்
பண்புடைமை தூதுரைப்பான் பண்பு. (681)
அன்பறி வாராய்ந்த சொல்வன்மை தூதுரைப்பார்க்
கின்றி யமையாத மூன்று. (682)
நூலாரு ணூல்வல்ல னாகுதல் வேலாருள்
வென்றி வினையுரைப்பான் பண்பு. (683)
அறிவுரு வாராய்ந்த கல்வியிம் மூன்றன்
செறிவுடையான் செல்க வினைக்கு. (684)

[2] दूतं चैव प्रकुर्वीत सर्वशास्त्रविशारदम् ।
इङ्गिताकारचेष्टज्ञं शुचिं दक्षं कुलोद्गतम् ।
अनुरक्तः शुचिर्दक्षः स्मृतिमान् देशकालवित् ।
वपुष्मान् वीतभीर्वाग्मी दूतो राज्ञः प्रशस्यते ॥ Manu. vii, 63-64.

In the *Kuṛaḷ*:[1]

'In term concise, avoiding wrathful speech, who utters pleasant word,
An envoy he who gains advantage for his lord.
An envoy meet is he, well-learned, of fearless eye,
Who speaks right home, prepared for each emergency.'

In the *Arthaśāstra*:[2]

The message is to be delivered *in toto,* even at the cost of life. . . . When questioned by the enemy king as to the strength of the lord's forces, pretend ignorance and simply say, 'you know better'!

Again in the *Kuṛaḷ*:[3]

'Integrity, resources, soul determined, truthfulness;
Who rightly speaks his message must these marks possess.
His faltering lips must utter no unworthy thing,
Who stands, with steady eye, to speak the mandates of his king.
Death to the faithful one his embassy may bring;
The envoy gains assured advantage for his king.'

[1] தொகச்சொல்லித் தூவாத நீக்கி நகச்சொல்லி
நன்றி பயப்பதாந் தூது. (685)
கற்றுக்கண் ணஞ்சான் செலச்சொல்லிக் காலத்தாற்
றக்க தறிவதாந் தூது. (686)

[2] शासनं च यथोक्तं ब्रूयात् । प्राणाबाधेऽपि दृष्टे + + +
परेण चोक्तः स्वासां प्रकृतीनां परिमाणं नाचक्षीत ।
'सर्वं वेद भवान्' इति ब्रूयात् । *Ar. Śās.*, Bk. i, 16.

[3] தூய்மை துணைமை துணிவுடைமை யிம்மூன்றின்
வாய்மை வழியுரைப்பான் பண்பு. (688)
விடுமாற்றம் வேந்தர்க் குரைப்பான் வடுமாற்றம்
வாய்சோரா வன்க ணவன். (689)
இறுதி பயப்பினு மெஞ்சா திறைவற்
குறுதி பயப்பதாந் தூது. (690)

The *Rājanītiratnākara*[1] quotes Śukra:

The ambassador, though a *mlēccha*, shall not be killed.

Hence the *dūta* is the king's eye. Even when the arms are raised aloft in the act of striking him, he should faithfully deliver his message.

From the words of the *dūta* who would think of his own defects and of the enemy's strength? For the *dūta* speaks always anything he thinks.

To the *Kuṛaḷ*:[2]

'Say not "He's young, my kinsman," despising thus your king;
But reverence the glory kingly state doth bring,'

the following[3] may be parallel:

'A king should not be despised even though a child. He is a great divinity in the form of a man.'

In the *Kuṛaḷ*[4] it is said:

'We've gained his grace, boots nought what graceless acts we do'.

[1] दूतो म्लेच्छोऽप्यवध्यः स्याद्राजा दूतमुखो यतः ।
उद्यतेष्वपि शस्त्रेषु दूतो वदति नान्यथा ॥
स्वापकर्षं परोत्कर्षं दूतोक्तैर्मन्यते च कः ।
सदैवावध्यभावेन दूतः सर्वं हि जल्पति । p. 46.

[2] இளைய ரினமுறைய ரென்றிகழார் நின்ற
ஒளியோ டொழுகப் படும். (698)

[3] बालोऽपि नावमन्तव्यो मनुष्य इति भूमिपः ।
महती देवता ह्येषा नररूपेण तिष्ठति ॥ Manu. vii, 8.

[4] கொளப்பட்டே மென்றெண்ணிக் கொள்ளாத செய்யார்
துளக்கற்ற காட்சி யவர். (699)
பழைய மெனக்கருதிப் பண்பல்ல செய்யுங்
கெழுதகைமை கேடு தரும். (700)

So deem not sages who the changeless vision view.
Who think "we're ancient friends," and do unseemly things;
To these familiarity sure ruin brings.

Similar ideas are found in the following discussion in the *Arthaśāstra*:[1]

Says Bhāradvāja: 'the king shall appoint as his ministers his classmates as he would have understood their honesty and tact. They could be easily trusted.' 'No,' says Viśālākṣa, 'as playmates they would not respect him. He shall therefore appoint those whose secrets are well known to him. Possessed of conduct and defects in common with the king these do not entertain harm to him lest their secrets should be divulged.' 'This is very common' says Parāśara 'for the king may follow them in their good and bad actions lest his own secrets be divulged.'

The *Kuṛaḷ*[2] defines:

'Where spreads fertility unfailing, where resides a band
Of virtuous men, and those of ample wealth, call that a "*land*".

[1] सहाध्यायिनोऽमात्यान् कुर्वीत दृष्टशौचसामर्थ्यत्वात् इति भारद्वाजः ।
ते ह्यस्य विश्वास्याः भवन्तीति ।
नेति विशालाक्षः । सहक्रीडितत्वात् परिभवन्त्येनम् ।
ये ह्यस्य गुह्यसधर्माणस्तानमात्यान् कुर्वीत—समानशीलव्यसनत्वात् ।
ते ह्यस्य मर्मज्ञभयान्नापराध्यन्तीति ।
साधरण एष दोष इति पराशरः—तेषामपि मर्मज्ञभयात् कृताकृतान्यनुवर्तेत ॥
Bk. i, ch. 8.

தள்ளா விளையுளுந் தக்காருந் தாழ்விலாச்
செல்வருஞ் சேர்வது நாடு. (731)
பெரும்பொருளாற் பெட்டக்க தாகி யருங்கேட்டா
லாற்ற விளைவது நாடு. (732)

That is a *"land"* which men desire for wealth's abundant share,
Yielding rich increase, where calamities are rare.'

Baudhāyana[1] says: 'A righteous man shall seek to dwell in a village where fuel, water, fodder, sacred fuel, *kuśa* grass, and garlands are plentiful, access to which is easy, where many rich people dwell, which abounds in industrious people and where Aryans form the majority, and which is not easily entered by robbers.'

What the *Kuraḷ* says:[2]

'Waters from rains and springs, a mountain near, and waters thence;
These make a *land*, with fortress' sure defence',

is also mentioned by the *Kauṭalīya*.[3]

The fortresses of rivers and mountains are sources of defence to the country parts.

Chapter 74 entitled நாடு of the *Kuraḷ* corresponds roughly to the chapter on जनपदनिवेश of the *Arthaśāstra,* Bk. ii, 1.

Chapter 75 entitled அரண் of the *Kuraḷ* corresponds roughly to the chapter on दुर्गविधान in the *Arthaśāstra*, Bk. ii, 3.

1 प्रभूतैधोदकयवससमित्कुशमाल्योपनिष्क्रमणमाढ्यजनाकुलमनलससमृद्धमार्यजनभूयिष्ठमदस्युप्रवेश्यं ग्राममावसितुंयतेत धार्मिकः ॥
II, iii, 51.
S. B. E, vol. xiv, pp. 243-4.

2 இருபுனலும் வாய்ந்த மலையும் வருபுனலும்
வல்லரணும் நாட்டிற் குறுப்பு. (737)

3 नदीपर्वतदुर्गं जनपदारक्षस्थानम् । *Ar. Śās.*, Bk. ii, 3.

What the *Kuraḷ*[1] says:

> 'Nothing exists, save wealth, that can
> Change man of nought to worthy man,'

is thus explained in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[2]

To a man of wealth, there are friends, and relatives. He is the worthy man of the world, and becomes a paṇḍita. He is a man of prowess and wisdom. He is a great man of good qualities.

What the *Kuraḷ* says:[3]

> 'Who plenteous store of glorious wealth have gained,
> By them the other two are easily obtained,'

is explained thus by Vātsyāyana:[4]

Between wealth and kingdom, wealth is superior. Through the means of wealth, *lōkayātrā* and *kāma* are realized. This is the position of the Trivarga.

---

1 பொருளல் லவரைப் பொருளாகச் செய்யும்
பொருளல்ல தில்லை பொருள். (751)

2 यस्यार्थास्तस्य मित्राणि यस्यार्थास्तस्य बान्धवाः ।
यस्यार्थाः स पुमान् लोके यस्यार्थाः स च पण्डितः ॥
यस्यार्थाः स च विक्रान्तो यस्यार्थाः स च बुद्धिमान् ।
यस्यार्थाः स महाभागो यस्यार्थाः स महागुणः ॥

Yuddha. ch. 83, 35, 36.

3 ஒண்பொருள் காழ்ப்ப வியற்றியார்க் கெண்பொரு
ளேனை யிரண்டு மொருங்கு. (760)

4 अर्थश्च राज्ञः ॥
अर्थस्तु राज्ञो गरीयान् इति ॥
तन्मूलत्वाल्लोकयात्रायाः ॥
वेश्यायाश्च ॥ इति त्रिवर्गप्रतिपत्तिः ।

Kāmasūtrā, Bk. I. ii, 15-17.

Cf. *Ar. Śās.,* Bk. viii. 3; cp. *Cāṇakya Rājanīti Śāstram,* iv. 21.

In the *Kuṛaḷ* it is said :[1]

'With stronger than thyself, turn from the strife away;
With weaker shun not, rather court the fray.'

Kauṭalya[2] prescribes: Court agreement of peace with equal and superior foes. Fight with the weaker.

According to the *Kuṛal*:[3]

'Women of double minds, strong drink, and dice: to these giv'n o'er,
Are those on whom the light of Fortune shines no more.'

In the *Arthaśāstra*:[4]

Public censure and loss of wealth are due to Kāma. . . . Kāma comprises hunting, gambling, women and drinking.

In the chapter on the *Puruṣavyasanavarga,* Kauṭalya refers to the four-fold vice under the category of Kāma. These are hunting, gambling, women and drinking. The effects of these evil habits are discussed in detail. Tiruvaḷḷuvar, on the other hand, devotes two chapters on the *vyasanas* of women (91 and 92), one

[1] வலியார்க்கு மாறேற்றல் ஓம்புக ஓம்பா
மெலியார்மேல் மேக பகை. (861)

[2] समज्यायोभ्यां सन्धीयेत । हीनेन विगृह्णीयात् । Bk. vii, 3.

[3] இருமனப் பெண்டிருங் கள்ளுங் கவறும்
திருநீக்கப் பட்டார் தொடர்பு. (920)

[4] परिभवः द्रव्यनाशः + + + कामः ।
+ + + + +
कामजस्तु–मृगया द्यूतं स्त्रियः पानमिति चतुर्वर्गः ॥ Bk. viii, 3.

chapter on drinking (93), and one chapter on gambling (94). Apparently the author of the *Kuṟaḷ* does not treat hunting as such a vice as the other three. In fact hunting is recognized as a valuable form of exercise to kings by Kālidāsa in his *Śākuntala*. Nor is Kauṭalya unaware of its beneficial effects.

Book III. KĀMATTUPPĀL

There are two views with regard to this particular section. One is that Vaḷḷuvar gives expression to purely Tamil aspect of Kāma. According to this the whole can be conveniently divided into Kaḷaviyal and Kaṟpiyal, and these again are based on the five *tiṇais* peculiar to the Tamils. But the celebrated commentator of the *Kuṟaḷ* would again find correspondences between this treatment of the subject and that in Sanskrit literature. According to that authority Kaḷaviyal and Kaṟpiyal correspond to the *saṁyōga* and *vipralambha* of the *Kāmasūtra* treatises. In the Kaṟpiyal section again Parimēlaḻagar would find corresponding terms for the different incidents like *śelavu* (Sans.=pravāsa), *āṟṟāmai* (Sans.=virāga), *viduppu* (Sans.=ayōgam), and *pulavi* (Sans.=mānam). The Sanskritists add the fifth incident *śāpa*. As this is quite uncommon, says the commentator, Vaḷḷuvar did not include it in his treatment of the subject. While the chapter (116) *pirivāṟṟāmai* is devoted to *śelavu*, the chapters (117-26) deal with the *āṟṟāmai*. *Viduppu* is dealt with in three chapters (127-9), while the last four chapters (130-33) are devoted to the incident of *pulavi*.[1]

[1] Ārumuga Nāvalar Ed., p. 384.

CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATIVE INSTITUTIONS

Sec. I. INTRODUCTORY

THE ancient Tamils whose culture and civilization were of no mean order had developed a wonderful system of polity, having very much in common with the North Indian polity, though in some respects strikingly original as we shall see in the sequel. There were organized political and administrative institutions which contributed much to the realization of the *muppāl* or three objects of life and the maintenance of orderliness of the society at large, technically known in Sanskrit literature as the *lōkayātrā*. But the development of this vast political machinery was the result of gradual growth extending over several centuries. By a slow process of evolution the simple organization of a patriarchy, developed itself into a complex organization with a strong central government and local institutions as is evident from the *Tirukkuṛaḷ* and then into the wider organization of an empire of a confederate type with small states forming auxiliaries to it, a feature of the age of the twin epics the *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai*. In other words we mark three chronological epochs in the story of this South Indian polity. These are the epoch of prehistorical times, the epoch of the *Tirukkuṛaḷ* and the epoch of the twin epics above referred to, answering roughly to an age before the fourth century B.C., the age between the fourth century and the first century B.C., and lastly the period covering the early centuries of the Christian era, approximately from the first to the fifth century.

Sec. II. PREHISTORICAL PERIOD

The chief source of information for this period is the great grammatical work, the *Tolkāppiyam*. Though the *Tolkāppiyam* can be roughly taken to be a composition of the fourth century B.C., yet most of the materials which the work treats of are much older and hence valuable in reconstructing the ancient history of South India. South India, in prehistorical days, was peopled by a number of tribes, of whom five could be distinguished according to the geographical classification of the soil[1]—the agriculturists, the pastoralists, the hunters, the people of the seashore and those of the desert. When these tribes began to settle down permanently on the soil, the need arose for some sort of organization. The family organization then led to the formation of a tribal organization of a patriarchal character. The Tamil social organization which had its distinctive characteristics born of environment, as anthropography holds, is unique in having realized the five different stages of human life in prehistoric times. But this social organization left its impress especially on the *mullai* (pastoral) and the *marudam* (agricultural) regions. Here the organization of the tribe was a settled fact. Single families led to joint families and these being welded together, became a stable organization of the whole tribe. When society became definitely organized and with an increase in its numerical strength, the neighbouring regions were encroached upon, the territory became expanded in course of time. The tribal chief who was the soldier and the judge rolled into one, became the territorial head, namely, the king.

The evolution of the status of the tribal chief to the head of the kingdom is then clearly seen in the regions

[1] See P. T. Śrīnivāsa Ayyangar, *The Stone Age*, p. 37.

of the *mullai* and the *marudam*. The king is designated among other names by *kō* or *kōṉ* meaning a cowherd. To the latter cattle was wealth, and the division of property among the sons was the division of the heads of cattle belonging to the family. We know that one form of wealth in earliest times was cattle. Therefore by the term *kōṉ* is meant that chief, whose wealth was cattle. This assumption is corroborated by the *Kalittogai*[1] wherein the origin of the dynasty of the *Pāṇḍyan* kings can probably be traced to the headship of the *āyar* tribe, the community of the cowherds in the *marudam* region. The same circumstances favoured the evolution of the institution of monarchy in the agricultural region. Agriculture was the mainstay of the people and catered

1 தென்னவன்
தொல்லிசை நட்ட குடியொடு தோன்றிய
நல்லினத் தாயர்

'The cowherd community which sprang up by the side of the ancient family of the Pāṇḍyan King.'

(*Mullaikkali* 104, ll. 4-6.)

வீவில் குடிப்பின் னிருங்குடி யாயரும், *Ibid.* 105, l. 7.

'The great tribe of the *āyars* who came after the ancient family of the Pāṇḍyans.'

Here *nalliṉam* refers to *gō* of Sanskrit literature and *nalliṉattāyar* means cowherds. There is another word *pulliṉam* prefixed to the *āyars* where it refers to the low castes among that community, those engaged in tending sheep and goats according to the commentator on the stanzas 107 and 110. A noteworthy point in this connection is the metaphorical stanza addressed to the king Parāntaka Pāṇḍyan

கோலெடுத்துக் கோத்தாத்த கோகனகச் செங்கைக்கு
வேலெடுத்துங் கோத்தாத்தல் விட்டிலனே—சால்படைத்த
பூபால னானாலும் போமோ பராந்தகற்குக்
கோபால னான குணம்.

quoted in the *Peruntogai* (894)—(*Sen Tamiḻ.*)

'Though the hand which once drove the *kō* (cattle) with a stick, now holds the lance, it has not given up the driving of *kō*. Hence though Parāntaka has become the king, will he be bereft of the inborn qualities of a Gōpāla (tender of cattle, protector of kings)'?

This verse can also be rendered as denoting the divinity of the king as an *avatār* of Lord Viṣṇu.

largely to the wants of the society. In an age when theft was rife and nomad adventurers were occupying the neighbouring hill, forests and desert tracts, the protection of farming and farmers necessitated the institution of kingship. It is reasonable to assume that the early king performed the same functions as those of the tribal chieftain. He was the warrior and judge. From the section on the *Puṟattiṇaiyiyal* of the *Poruḷadikāram* we are in a position to glean details as regards the art of war as practised in ancient Tamil India. Otherwise the *Tolkāppiyam* does not very much help us in determining the functions or rights pertaining to the king of much earlier days, though it makes a distinct mention of the three kings, the Cōḻa, Cēra and the Pāṇḍya. In fact the institution of kingship was still in an undeveloped stage, whose functions were not yet enlarged, the king being primarily engaged in love and partly in war. Possibly he took part in the public and crude sacrifices in honour of the ancient deities like Vēlaṉ, Māyōṉ, and the several tutelary deities among whom were goddesses also. Again whenever hostilities broke out, he led the host in war and showed much heroic valour in the contest. We do not go here into the details of warfare which depended on the five *tiṇais,* as these are discussed in a later chapter on the Art of War. Thus, then, there were various forces at work which brought up the genesis of a society from the scattered crumbs of tribal systems. Society expanded itself and a division of classes was distinguished based on profession in one and the same region. There were kings, noblemen, agriculturists, traders, labourers and servants. When social institutions began to stay in the land, the necessity for a leader resulted in the birth of the Kingship which virtually represented the state.

Sec. III. THE EPOCH OF THE TOLKĀPPIYAM

In the age to which Tolkāppiyaṉār belonged, Aryan ideas and ideals had penetrated South India and had influenced a good deal the Tamil culture. For the *Tolkāppiyam* refers to the four-fold classification of castes, *araśar* (*Kṣatriyas*), *antaṇar* (Brahmanas), *vaṇikar* (merchants) and *vēḷāḷar* (agriculturists).[1] The Vēḷāḷas became in their turn divided into two classes, the higher and the lower. It is significant to note that the term *Śūdra* is not to be found in this grammatical work. The petty chiefs or the Kuṟunilamaṉṉar generally belonged to the Vēḷāḷa community.[2] According to Naccinārkkiṉiyar these Vēḷāḷas had marital relations with royal families, served as army commanders and were chieftains of smaller kingdoms. This social democracy of a simpler type was disturbed by a socio-religious institution with the consequence[3] that a complex social organization set in. The result of all this was that the office of kingship grew in power and extent. Much dignity was attached to that institution. The king was hedged in with divinity. In the *sūtras* of the *Tolkāppiyam*,[4] we are introduced to two *tuṟais*, among others belonging to the category of the seven *tiṇais* called *uṉṉanilai*[5] and *pūvainilai*.[6] According to the first the king is compared to the sacred tree *uṉṉam*, and this comparison is generally to that conquering monarch who would not retreat from the field of action. That a certain amount of sanctity was attached to this tree is obvious from the fortieth stanza in the *Padiṟṟuppattu*. Again according

[1] *Poruḷ Sūtra*, 75.
[2] *Seṉ Tamiḻ*, vol. ii, p. 366.
[3] *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture*, p. 20.
[4] 60 & 76 வெறியறி சிறப்பின், கடந்தா வேலைவ.

to the second *turai* mentioned above, the king is further compared to *māyōṉ* or God Viṣṇu, thus showing the sacredness of the king's person. He is a member of the Kṣatriya community whose duties to the state are five in number:[1] teaching, performing sacrifices, gifts, protection and the award of punishment. This is more in accordance with the ruling of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*.

Whether the kingship was hereditary or elective, we cannot determine with any definiteness from the materials available. That the choice of a king depended on the goodwill of the citizens at large is evident from a *turai* of the seven *tiṇais* entitled *piḷḷaiyāṭṭu*.[2] When a prince of the blood-royal offered a bold front in the battle and secured victory, the people celebrated his success with festivities and crowned him king. From the *sūtra* (76) it can be gathered that there was the institution of a Court of Justice where elders sat in judgment on the cases brought before them. Only duly qualified persons became members. Born of a noble family, learned, of good character, truthful, honest, impartial, pure and unavaricious were the members of this court.[3]

The same *sūtra* contains evidence of another fact of great importance. This was the relinquishing of the throne called *kaṭṭil*. It seems that after having ruled the kingdom according to the established laws of the land satisfactorily and well, the king used to relinquish his office in the evening of his life, to lead a life of penance and prayer. This fact of abdication is also a feature of the North Indian polity. We know even in the historical period that Candragupta Maurya and Aśoka abdicated the throne with the same object.

[1] ஐவகை மரபின் அரசர் பக்கம்—ஓதல், காத்தல், வேட்டல், ஈதல், தண்டஞ்செய்தல்.

[2] பிள்ளையாட்டு.

[3] See *Poruḷadikāra ārāyicci*, p. 129.

Sec. IV. THE EPOCH OF THE TIRUKKUṚAḶ

The *Tirukkuṛaḷ* marks a definite stage in the evolution of Tamil political institutions. The kingdom has expanded and the social organization has become more and more complex in character. Direct personal rule of the king could no longer be effective or efficient; and a devolution of functions became imperative. The functions of the Central Government and its relations with the local Government came to be defined. The character of the central organization to be found in the *Kuṛaḷ* was such as ‘welded the local organizations for local purposes into one unity which might be the state of those times. The local organizations were certainly of a democratic character, and rested for certain purposes on the communal basis. The devolution of power was complete. The central organization had merely the control of local administration, the maintenance of peace and order in the country and providing for defence against external enemies."[1] The end of the State. according to Vaḷḷuvar, was *der gesellschaftliche cultur zweck*. In other words the State wedded itself to the promotion of the material and moral welfare of the people. The means to this end was the realization of the *trivarga* or the *muppāl*, constituting *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*. This was incumbent on the king as well as his subjects. The king was to adhere to the path of virtue in acquiring wealth and enjoying sense-pleasure. Over-indulgence in any one of these three aims of life would lead to rack and ruin. Hence the king is warned to adopt a middle course in the realization of the principle of *trivarga*. The political maxims are largely swayed by moral and ethical considerations. Expediency is relegated to a subordinate place as it is

[1] S. K. Ayyangar: *Some Contributions of S.I. to Ind Culture*, p. 402.

a questionable means of realizing the state-ends, proximate and ultimate.

The idea that the State is an organism (*saptāṅgam rājyam* as described in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*[1] and in the *Arthaśāstra*),[2] is also that of Vaḷḷuvar as is borne out by the *Kuṟaḷ*. A state is a seven-limbed kingdom. The ministry, fortifications, territory, allies, the army, and the treasury are the six limbs. These together with the king make up the kingdom or the state. The chief constituent element of a state is its territory. Territory implies a definitely-marked area of land well-suited for human habitation and rich in resources on account of its fertility. It is such as will yield an unfailing supply of food-stuffs, and conduce to the healthy existence of the people and cattle. To keep this territory safe and secure, strong defensive works are indispensable. One efficient system of ancient defences was by means of impregnable fortresses. In those days when marauders and highway-robbers infested the land, life and property were not safe, unless the king of the land was strong in arms and possessed a good fort.[3] The king lived invariably in a well-fortified palace, called *kōyil*. The king's seat was known as *kaṭṭil*. He was surrounded by his councillors and ministers, besides his personal servants. When the king gave public audience in the Hall of State, both nobles and common people were present. There were bards who sang his benevolent acts and warlike deeds. There were heralds (*ahavar*) who proclaimed his greatness and *vaḷḷuvar* who published his orders and proclamations.[4]

The king.—The king, according to the *Kuṟaḷ*, must be one who possesses the following characteristics: courage,

[1] ix, 264-6.
[2] Bk. vi, sec. 1.
[3] See the chapter on the *Art of War*.
[4] See *Pre-Aryan Culture*, p. 33.

liberality, knowledge and energy. He must endeavour to establish virtue (*aram*) and eliminate vice. While maintaining strict discipline, the king must rule the land with grace and love. He should increase his treasure to be expended on the state, and he must be easily accessible to every citizen. He should speak pleasant words and defend the realm with strict justice.[1] He should be well versed in the right kind of learning which would make him well disciplined in body and mind.[2] An unlearned king could not play any useful part in the Council.[3] Hence he should endeavour to feed his ears with rare and learned teachings.[4] He should anticipate and provide against dangers that might overtake the kingdom and himself, and prepare to face them boldly and rightly.[5] He should appoint devoted and qualified men to be his companions and counsellors and in previous consultation with them make up his mind and act.[6] The counsellors are the eyes of the king and hence good companionship is an asset.[7] Says the *Kural*

> 'With chosen friends deliberate: next use their private thought; (*judgment*)
> Then act. By those who thus proceed all works with ease are wrought.'[8]

The king must not undertake any work rashly. He should carefully weigh the amount of expenditure it would involve, and also the return from such expenditure. He should plan his expeditions, without the enemy getting the least scent of them.[9] In such undertakings, the strength or otherwise of one's own power, the suitability of the time and of the place must be taken

1 *Kural-venbās*, 382-8.
2 *Ibid*, 391.
3 *Ibid.*, 405.
4 *Ibid*, 413.
5 *Ibid.*, 429-36.
6 *Ibid.*, ch. xlv.
7 *Ibid.*, 459.
8 *Ibid.*, 462.
9 *Ibid.*, ch. xlvii.

well into consideration,[1]—*Śaktidēśakālabalābalam* of the *Kauṭalīya*.

The appointment of all the important officers of the State must, in the first instance, be made by subjecting the candidates to severe tests by means of the four *upadhās—dharma, artha, kāma* and *bhaya*. Only after having thus been fully satisfied with a man's honesty and loyalty the king should entrust him with an important work. The government servant shall endeavour to promote the arts of peace and try to avert whatever would hinder real progress. Even after the appointment, he shall find out by means of special commissioners whether each officer conducts himself well in his place.[2] The king must wield a just sceptre by awarding condign punishments to real offenders. When the king rules according to the established laws of the land, then alone will the kingdom be blessed with seasonal and unfailing showers, and the earth yield in abundance. A despotic king, on the other hand, who is not accessible to his subjects, who consults not his counsellors and who is not impartial in dealing out punishments, will lose the confidence of his people and be ruined.[3] Hence after proper investigation and trial the case should be decided on its merits. In all his acts and deeds the king must be energetic and ever active. He must display the quality of *utthāna* which Kauṭalya so much values in a monarch.[4]

The minister.—The next limb of the State is the ministry. The responsibilities of the minister are great. He must be learned and should discharge his functions according to the means, time, and place. He must be firm in his resolution and never tired of strenuous effort. Before any final decision is arrived at, a minister should

[1] *Kural,* ch. xlviii, xlix and l.
[2] *Ibid.,* ch. li, lii.
[3] *Ibid*, ch. lv, lvi.
[4] *Ibid.,* ch. lx.

deeply ponder over its different aspects. He should pursue the path of *dharma*. and give counsel according to circumstances. Mere theoretical knowledge would not do, but what is wanted is common sense in practical application. He must speak nothing but the truth, even though it should be unpleasant to the king. He is a bad minister who would secretly plot against the ruler.[1]

Further, he must speak pleasantly, but rightly and only good things. There must be power in his speech as on it depends the success or failure of the Government. What is more needed is purity in action[2] and power in action.[3] The minister should endeavour to overcome all obstacles in the way of progress and should persevere in this course until success is achieved. He should deal promptly with work on hand as also with the foreign enemy. Neglect and delay may spell ruin. He should never act on his own judgment, but take the advice of experts in the accomplishment of every task.[4]

There was the Council Chamber called *avai* where the ministers of the state met and discussed the problems affecting the state. The *dūtas* or ambassadors and the officers of the Intelligence Department who belonged to the category of spies were also drafted from the ministerial class. The several functions and powers of these officers are dealt with in the next chapter on the Art of War. It is said that he is a weak member who has no experience of the Council. Though an eloquent member would carry the Council with him, still to the words of a learned member grown grey in experience, great value was attached. Selfless men would discern the attitude of the members and try to convince them with their

[1] *Kuṛal*, ch. lxiv.
[2] வினைத்தூய்மை.
திட்பம்.
[4] *Ibid.*, ch. lxv-lxviii.

discourse. One should not be afraid of the Council and should pursue a middle path. A bold and strong line should always be taken.[1]

Other elements of State.—The other elements of the State are then discussed. The State must possess a considerable territory. It must be fertile and filled with righteous men. It must yield an unfailing supply of foodstuffs and be free from disease and famine. According to Vaḷḷuvar an ideal territory is to be healthy, fertile, pleasant, well-defended and wealthy.[2] The proper territory is that which is defended by fortifications against the disturbers of peace. The uses of the fortress and the methods of its construction are dealt with in the next chapter.[3] The fifth element of the state is the Treasury. A king should aim at a well-filled treasury. Wealth is said to be the unfailing lamp of a state. It must be got by righteous means. Crooked ways of earning wealth are condemned. Wealth is the sure source of strength to a state, and indispensable to the realization of the other two aims of life—*dharma* and *kāma*.[4]

The sixth element of the kingdom is the Army. The full host endowed with martial spirit and determined to conquer the foe is the treasure of treasures to a state. Vaḷḷuvar seems to advocate an hereditary army. A well-disciplined army is not afraid of the horrors of war, but squarely faces them to save the country's honour and glory. But the success of an army largely depends on its leaders. He is a true hero who shows unflinching courage in the field of action, and considers that day wasted in which he does not receive a wound. Heroic death in the field of battle is the shortest road to heaven.

[1] *Kuṛaḷ*, ch. lxxii-lxxiii. [2] *Ibid*, ch. lxxiv.
[3] See ch. vi of this book. [4] *Kuṛaḷ*, ch. lxxvi.

The last element of the State is the Ally. It is hard to find true friendship. The chief characteristics of friendship are thus stated:

> 'Friendship from ruin saves, in way of virtue keeps;
> In troublous time, it weeps with him who weeps.'[1]

One must thoroughly investigate the character and conduct of a man before making his friendship. The *Kuṛaḷ* commends old and faithful friends who will stand by one to the end in weal or woe.[2] In chapter lxxxii and the following, Vaḷḷuvar condemns false friendship, feigned alliance, and such other time-serving alliances. The above examination of the elements of sovereignty would appear to show the author's familiarity with the *saptāṅga* system of Sanskrit literature.

Sec. V. THE EPOCH OF THE EPICS

From the Kingdom to an Empire.—We have so far dealt with the political theories which were prevalent in ancient Tamil land, and the political ideas and ideals that could be gleaned from the *Tolkāppiyam* and the *Kuṛaḷ*. Let us now turn our attention to other works of the Śaṅgam period, especially the two epics from which the institutions mentioned above appear to have been in regular working order at that period. The tribal chieftain has grown into an imperial ruler. Permanent elements of political life are found in big States enjoying independence. A new outlook in politics has come into being. The independent ruler aims at a paramount position of overlordship. In the various odes of the *Puṛam* and the *Aham,* in the *Padiṟṟuppattu,* and in the twin epics, we have clear indications of this struggle for

[1] *Kuṛaḷ-veṇbā,* 787. [2] *Ibid.,* 809.

overlordship. In other words, fired with the lust of conquest and imperialistic ideas, the several powerful chieftains engaged in wars with their neighbours and either annexed their kingdoms by defeating them or created vassal states. Some of them even extended their arms to the far distant north as far as the Himalayas.[1] The great Cōḻa king Karikālaṉ may be said to be the father of this imperialistic movement.[2] This thirst for universal rule manifested itself in the ambition of the Cōḻas, Pāṇḍyas, and the Cēras to realize the organic unity so far as it related to political life. One form of suzerainty was to wear a garland of seven crowns. This was claimed as a matter of right by a powerful monarch of the Cēra line.[3] The real authority was glorified, and even became deified.

The Character of the Kingship.—The kingship was generally hereditary,[4] though there was also the system of election which seems to have been of a formal kind. The king was a constitutional monarch. He ruled the land according to the well-established laws of the realm. There was then the anointment ceremony, known as *maṇṇumaṅgalam,* the *abhiṣēka* of Sanskrit literature. The kings realized the evil effects of tyrannical rule as well as the beneficent results of just rule. The *Maṇimēkalai* gives us a graphic description of a tyrant's reign.

If the king did swerve from the righteous path,
  The planets all would change their course;
If the planets errant turn,
  Would dearth of rain surely ensure;
If dearth of rain there were,
  Nothing on earth would then survive.

[1] *Silap.,* canto v, ll. 89-94. [2] *Ibid.,* ll. 95-110.
[3] *Padiṟṟu* 14 and its comment: *Silap.,* canto xxviii, l. 169.
[4] முறைமுதற்கட்டில் *Silap.* canto xxvii, l. 134.

There would then be no room for saying,
That he who rules as king on earth
Should regard as his own the life of each living thing.[1]

The characteristics of a just ruler as can be gathered from an ode are to stand heroically in the field of battle and not to harass the retreating enemy, to have only one wife for queen, to appoint learned and impartial judges and award just punishment, and to cement oneself with the bond of friendship.[2]

The Conduct of the Princes.—One noteworthy feature of this just rule is the conduct of the king towards the princes. Only good and well-behaved sons of the king were anointed as crown princes and were shown due regard and honour. Refractory sons were severely dealt with. There is the semi-legendary story of *Maṉunītikaṇḍacōḻaṉ* who had his son crushed under the wheels of a chariot for having unwittingly let his vehicle run over a calf, for which its mother, the cow pleaded for justice by approaching the palace and ringing the bell of justice with its horns.[3] Other instances are not lacking. Kōpperuñ-Cōḻaṉ is said to

1 கோனிலை திரிந்திடிற் கோணிலை திரியுங்
கோணிலை திரிந்திடின் மாரிவறங் கூரு
மாரிவறங் கூரின் மன்னுயி ரில்லை
மன்னுயி ரெல்லா மண்ணாள் வேந்தன்
றன்னுயி ரென்னுந் தகுதியின் றாகும். *Maṇi.* vii. ll. 8-12.
கொடியனெம் மிறையெனக் கண்ணீர் பரப்பிக்
குடிபழி தூற்றுங் கோலனா குக. *Kali*, 8 1-3. Cf. *Puram*, 22, 71.

2 See the *Puram* 71, attributed to the king Pūtappāṇḍiyan.

3 சால மறைத்தோம்பிச் சான்றவர் கைகரப்பக்
காலை கழிந்ததன் பின்றையும்—மேலைக்
கறவைக்கன் றூர்ந்தானைத் தந்தையு மூர்ந்தான்
முறைமைக்கு மூப்பிளமை யில். *Palamoḻi*, 93.

have banished his two sons out of the kingdom.[1] Tittan the Cōla king at Uraiyūr had his only son Peru-Narkilli banished.[2] According to the *Maṇimēkalai,* when Killivalavan heard his only son Udayakumaran was slain by one Viñjaiyan (Vidyādhara) for having attempted to commit adultery, he rejoiced at the punishment awarded to him.[3]

Abdication.—It was also, at that time, a custom for the reigning monarch to abdicate the throne at a certain age and take to a life of penance or the *vānaprastha āśrama.* It is said that Kōpperuñ-Cōlan relinquished the coveted honours pertaining to the crown and took to penance.[4] The usual method was that the reigning chieftain nominated his successor, subject of course, to ratification later on, by the Council and the Assembly.

Interregnum.—Sometimes it happened that a king suddenly died and no successor was nominated. This would result in a period of interregnum. There is a graphic but metaphorical picture of such an interregnum in the *Śilappadikāram.*[5] Bereft of the metaphor the following is the substance of the passage:

Like the stranger chief who, in disquiet times
 When the land is sorely troubled, bereft
Of her sovereign lord, with none beside
 To ascend the vacant throne and to guard her
With his powerful force, swooping down
 Stays to harass the unhappy land
Leaving loyal subjects to weep and wail,
 Lawless evil-doers to wax in crime.

This means an interregnum resulted in disorder and anarchy, the *mātsyanyāya* of the Sanskrit political litera-

[1] *Puram,* 213. [2] *Ibid,* 80. [3] Canto xxii, ll. 205-13.
[4] *Ibid.,* 214. [5] *Ibid,* iv. ll. 1-26.

ture. The lesser chieftains throw off the yoke of allegiance and attempt to assert their independence. In the confusion that ensues, there is no security for person and property. But it does not necessarily lead to the subversion of law and order. If the administrative machinery is efficient, the government goes on smoothly uninterrupted by the state of *arājaka* or kinglessness. For example, when the Pāṅḍyan king was suddenly struck dead by the curse of the pious Kaṇṇaki, there was no disorder and it would appear that the Council of ministers carried on the administration until a successor was elected.[1]

Peculiar method of election.—If there was a contest about the succession, and if the claimants to the throne were more than one, decision was arrived at by the peculiar method of getting the State elephant to choose and garland the right person. In the commentary on the *Paḻamoḻi*[2] the commentator narrates an interesting story. Once, when the ruler of the Cōḻa country died childless, a dispute arose as to the succession to the throne. It became a great source of anxiety to the ministry who resolved on the above-mentioned peculiar method of election. Having blind-folded the eyes of the State elephant, they let loose the animal with the resolution to crown as king whomsoever it brought on its back. It is said that this elephant passed through many places and came at last to Karuvūr. Here it took Karikāṛcōḻaṉ on its back and returned to Kaḻumalam. Karikālaṉ was then anointed king.

[1] *Silap.*, canto xxvii, ll. 132-8.

[2] கழுமலத் தியாத்த களிறும் கருவூர்
விழுமியோன் மேற்சென் றதனால்—விழுமிய
வேண்டினும் வேண்டா விடினும் உறற்பால
தீண்டா விடுதல் அரிது. (62)

The Purōhita.—Some of the kings had become so much Aryanized that they performed the *yajñas* incumbent on the Kṣatriya monarchs. One part of the name of a king goes by the name of the sacrifice itself—Rājasūyamvēṭṭa-perunaṟkiḷḷi.[1] It is said that Palyāṉaiccelkeḻukuṭṭuvaṉ, brother of Neduñcēralātaṉ and son of Udiyaṉcēral performed ten *yajñas* besides feeding the guests on a lavish scale.[2] The fact that sacrifices were offered by the kings who caused sacrifices to be performed by the Brahmanas shows, beyond doubt, that these kings became Kṣatriyas and adopted the duties of a Kṣatriya ruler as prescribed in the *Dharmasūtras.* There is a reference in the *Puṟam* (166) to a *yajña* performed by a Brahmana Viṇṇandāyaṉ (Viṣṇudāsan) of Pūñjāṟṟūr. These and other references to the Vēdic sacrifices[3] point to a system of social polity marked by the growing influence of sacerdotalism. In other words the *Purōśu* (San. *purōhita*) or the State chaplain plays a significant role in the administration. The conquering monarch had trust in his own military prowess, but looked to the priest for a moral sanction of his action and a formal recognition of his deeds. Sacerdotalism inculcated obedience and discipline and led to the permanence of allegiance so long as the king preserved law and order according to the customs of the land. This is in other words a healthy combination of *śastra* (arms) and *śāstra* (science), which ultimately leads to the happy consummation, in the words of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra.* What the *Arthaśāstra* rules is that sheer prowess is of no avail, as also sheer intellect. Prowess tempered by intellect often leads to success. Such a State progresses, never degenerates.

[1] *Puṟam,* 367. [2] See *Paḻamoḻi* 316. *Śilap.* xxviii, ll. 137-8.
[3] *Puṟam,* 15, 26, 166 and 224.

From the term *amaiccu* which can be translated as ministry, it is inferable that the Purōhita was a member of the ministry. *Amaiccu* is derived from *amaiccan̲*, the Tamilized form of the Sanskrit word *amātya*. We have definite references from the *Padiṟṟuppattu* to the Purōhita of kings like Palyān̲aiccelkēḻukuṭṭuvan̲ and Śelvakkaḍuṅgōn̲. The name of the Purōhita of Celkeḻukuṭṭuvan̲ is mentioned as Neḍumbāratāyan̲ār (Sans. the great Bhāradvāja). It is said that having learnt that his Purōhita was getting ready to go to the forests for penance, the king set out before him.[1] The other reference is in the *padikam* of the Seventh Ten. Here the phrase *Purōśu mayakki* occurs. In addressing the king Śelvakkaḍuṅgōn̲, the poet says that he is more dharmaic and learned than his own Purōhita.

It is not difficult to ascertain what the chief functions expected of the royal priest were. The first was to aid the king in the performance of sacrifices. Next, he seconded all the king's undertakings, whether civil or military, by means of prayers and incantations. Thirdly, it was his duty to forestall and avert all dangers providential or otherwise. We know of the case of the Cēra king Yān̲aikkaṭ-cēy whose death within seven days from the fall of the *dhūmakētu*, the fatal star, was predicted by the astrologer. Nor were his functions purely religious. He advised the king also in matters of general administrative policy.

Some Royal Amusements.—Hunting was a favourite amusement. It was a common pastime with the hill-tribes as well as nobles. In ancient India whether to the North of the Vindhya or the South, hunting was a

[1] *Padiṟṟu* iii. *Padikam.*

favourite pastime with the kings and was regarded as an effective physical exercise.[1] Hunting expeditions are also referred to in the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* as a source of amusement. Bows and arrows were the chief arms used in hunting, and dogs were also employed by these hunters.[2]

Under the category of amusements may be mentioned residence at the summer resort of the king. The king lived generally in a well-fortified city. But his life was not confined to the palace. He often resorted to what can now be called a pleasure residence, *ilavandikaippaḷḷi.*[3] It would appear that this residence of the king was situated in the midst of an ideal park, furnished with various mechanical contrivances to be used at the pleasure of the king. The chief among these was to get air and water, wherever desired. It was also known as *nīrāḻimaṇḍapam*[4] chiefly used by kings during summer. From the colophon to the odes[5] of the *Puṟam* it is seen that Pāṇḍyan Naṉmāṟaṉ and Cōḻaṉ Nalaṅkiḷḷi-śēṭceṉṉi had each such a pleasure residence. It is also said that the Pāṇḍyan Naṉmāṟaṉ died in that residence.

The king no autocrat.—Though much importance was attached to the king's person and the kingly institution, still the king was no autocrat. He could not be absolute in the circumstances in which he was placed. His power was so limited by a system of checks and balances, the Council, the Purōhita and public opinion, that he dared not misuse his rights. We have evidence

[1] See Kālidāsa's verse in the *Śākuntala* on the effects of hunting.

[2] See *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai,* ll. 117-29.

[3] *இலவந்திகைப்பள்ளி.*

[4] *நீராழி மண்டபம்.*

[5] 55 and 61.

in practice of the paternal principle so sacred to the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* and eloquently echoed by the Edicts of Aśoka.[1] The real motive underlying the grand conception is that the king looked upon his subjects as his children. Just as a father would care for the good and welfare of the children, so also the king is expected to bestow his attention on the progress of his State. In the course of his address to the Cēra king Oḷvāṭ-kōpperuñjēral-irumpoṟai[2] the poet Nariverūuttalaiyār says: 'Do not be guided by the advice of those who are devoid of love and sympathy and who hence court hell as their future abode. Protect your kingdom as you would your child. It will endow you with a choice gift which is indeed rare and invaluable.'[3]

Thus the ancient rulers of the Tamil land were law-abiding and benevolent. They were actuated by the welfare of the people, and they so conducted themselves as to win the love and esteem of all their subjects. When they felt they had done a wrong, they did not hesitate to call for and submit to the proper punishment. When the Pāṇḍyan king came to know of the unjust execution of Kōvalaṉ, his heart at once broke, and he died of irreparable grief.[4] Again in the course of his night-rounds round the city, one Pāṇḍyan king for creating suspicion in a Brahmana of Koṟkai that he went to his

[1] Bk. ii. 1: separate Kaliṅga Edicts.

[2] ஒள்வாட் கோப்பெருஞ்சேர லிரும்பொறை

[3] அருளு மன்பு நீக்கி நீங்கா
நிரயங் கொள்பவரொ டொன்றாது காவல்
குழவி கொள்பவரி னோம்புமதி
யளிதோ தானேயது பெறலருங் குரைத்தே.

Puṟam 5, ll. 5-9.

[4] *Silap*, canto xx, ll. 77-8.

house for committing adultery with his wife, cut off his hand as a fitting punishment, and leaving it on the front verandah of the house, returned to his palace.[1] These are two out of many examples to show how the ancient kings loved to pursue the path of *aṟam* or righteousness, and whenever they erred they courted voluntary punishment according to the rules laid down in the *dharma nūl*[2] as well as the *artha nūl*.[3] Perhaps the *nūl* which Tiruvaḷḷuvar refers to is some *Arthaśāstra* or *Dharmaśāstra* or both. The king who was versed in such sciences based his administration and policy on the rules laid down; and so long as he conducted the ship of the State with that policy, success was ensured, as also life in heaven after death.[4]

Daily Programme.—It would appear that a programme of work was marked out, according to which the king was expected to spend the day and the night. We have no information, however, of the respective division into periods with separate functions allocated to each, as there is in the *Arthaśāstra*.[5] From the *Puṟam* anthology, we are enabled to see that the day at least, perhaps also the night, was divided into three periods, each of four hours. During the day from 6 to 10 a.m. the king was engaged in religious and spiritual exercises. From 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. he was probably seated in the Durbar Hall surrounded by his courtiers, when he dispensed justice. The last four hours of the day were perhaps given to meeting the learned poets and awarding presents to them. The night, excepting the time devoted to rest, amusement, and sleep, was spent in pondering over

[1] *Paḻamoḻi* 102, *Silap, kaṭṭurai,* xxiii, ll. 42-52.
[2] *Puṟam,* 34 and the gloss of the 15th.
[3] *Ibid.,* 166 see *the gloss.*
[4] *Puṟam,* 249.
[5] Bk. I. 19.

other State business, perhaps with regard to enemy and military operation.[1]

Duties and Rights of Kings.—The concept of *muppāl*, the special feature of the *Kuṛaḷ* is further developed in the Śaṅgam works and the aim of the State is said to be the realization of these three ends of life. The king should control the government with the advice of his loyal ministers.[2] He should again endeavour to follow the established law and not swerve in the least from it.[3] But in the administration of the law of the land, the king should be guided by knowledge (*aṟivu*) and love (*aṉbu*).[4] The implication is that the king should possess a full knowledge of the *Śāstras*, and in enunciating his policy he should use that knowledge, tempered, of course, by the noble quality of kindly sympathy. For example, he is asked to put up with the

[1] அதனால், அறவோன் மகனே மறவோர் செம்மால்
...உரைப்பக் கேண்மதி
நின்னூற்றம் பிறரறியாது
பிறர்கூறிய மொழிதெரியா
ஞாயிற் றெல்லை யாரா வினைக் குதவி
யிரவி னெல்லை வருவது நாடி
யுரை...

(*Puram*, 366, ll. 11-15.)

(See also the commentary on the *Puram*, 69.)

[2] *Puram*, 74.

பாஅல்புளிப்பினும் பகலிருளினு
நாஅல்வேத நெறிதிரியினுந்
திரியாச் சுற்றமொடு முழுதுசேண் விளங்கி

Ibid., 2, ll. 17-19.

[3] *Ibid.*, 2.

ஞாயிற் றன்ன வெந்திற லாண்மையுந்
திங்க ளன்ன தண்பெருஞ் சாயலும்
வானத் தன்ன வண்மையு மூன்று
முடைமை யாகி யில்லோர் கையற
நீ நீடுவாழிய

Ibid., 55, ll. 13-17.

enemy's acts of omission and commission in the first instance.[1] But the same ode says that, if the enemy should persist in the same course taking advantage of his leniency, he ought to be curbed effectively. In other words, one must not be provocative.[2] Another ancient ode says that the monarch should be heroic like the sun, loving like the moon and large-hearted like the rains. He must speak sweet words, at once pleasing and convincing. At the same time he should give a patient hearing to what his subjects might bring to his notice. This means that the audience of His Majesty was to be open to all, irrespective of their social status and rank.[3] In fact the institution of kingship is deemed so important that it is said that the king is the soul of the world. The king should realize this in the discharge of his duties.[4] A beautiful ode[5] says that it is not rice that gives us life nor the waters, but it is the king who endows the world with life. The king ensures security by the exercise of his *daṇḍa*.

The chief functions of the king may then be categorically stated. They were, first, to defend the land against invading enemies and to offer protection to his subjects. In defending the State, the king was to prevent the enemy from crossing the boundary limits. But when once the enemy was in, the monarch should show prowess in the field and achieve full measure of success in the action with or without the help of an ally. The ally who sincerely lent a helping hand was to be applauded.[6] Such conquest

[1] *Puram*, 2. [2] *Ibid*, 55.
[3] *Ibid.*, 35 and 40. [4] *Ibid.*, 86.
[5] நெல்லு முயிரன்றே நீரு முயிரன்றே
மன்ன னுயிர்த்தே மலர்தலை யுலக
மதனால், யானுயி ரென்ப தறிகை
வேன்மிகு தானை வேந்தற்குக் கடனே. *Puram*, 186.
[6] *Ibid.*, 190 and 239.

enables the conquering monarch to aim at the *dig-vijaya* by leading his army round the world to earn an everlasting name both in this and in the other world.[1] It has been generally the ruling passion of Hindu monarchs who aimed at suzerain power. There is an inscription of the Gupta Emperor Samudragupta which is to the same effect; *rājādhirājaḥ pṛthvīm avajitya divam jayati.*

This conquest was righteous conquest of arms, the *dharma vijaya* of the *Arthaśāstra* and of the inscriptions of Aśoka, and the *aṟappōr* of Tamil literature.[2] The next duty of the king was to keep law and order. He was to earn money by righteous methods and distribute it among the poets and the deserving.[3] He should protect the poor and the helpless. He was to take particular interest in the promotion of agriculture and commerce.[4] That these two were an index of a nation's prosperity is testified to by the *Maduraikkāñci.*[5] We know Neduñcēralātan as patron of trade and agriculture. The idea is that only when the ruler walks in the path of *dharma,* there will be seasonal rains, good crops, and the people will stand rooted in *svadharma,* each discharging the duties expected of him by the society at large.[6] Besides, the king engaged himself in certain avowed religious observances. Of these the performance of Vēdic sacrifices was the most important.[7] According to the belief of those times, that king who performed such sacrifices found a place in the kingdom of Indra. Again he was to award gifts, but not to receive any.

1 *Puṟam,* 31 and 225.
2 *Ibid.,* 9 and 62.
3 *Ibid.,* 184 and 239.
4 *Ibid* 35; *Padiṟṟu.* 13, ll. 23-4.
5 வியன்மேவன் விழுச்செல்வத்து
இருவகையா னிசைசான்ற
சிறுகுடிப் பெருந்தொழுவர்
குடிகெழீஇய நானிலவரொடு.
6 *Maṇi.,* canto i, ll. 33-4.
7 *Puṟam,* 26, see *supra.*

This receiving of gifts by a monarch, it may be noted in passing, is severely condemned by the *Dharmaśāstras*. It seems to have been a common notion that the ruler of the land could give, but not take.[1] To advert to what we have already said, a righteous king who lived to a ripe old age, abdicated the throne and went to the forests to do penance and prayer.[2]

To make his administration a success and to win eternal fame for himself the king is enjoined by the *Arthaśāstra* not to indulge in many vices of which the chief are four. These are hunting, women, drinking and gambling.[3] According to an old stanza quoted by the commentator of the *Puṟapporuḷ veṇbāmālai*, the king is asked to avoid the seven vices.[4] These are hunting, harsh speech, torture, gambling, covetousness, drinking, and sexual commerce (*kāma*).[5]

Hunting is not generally condemned as it would produce a salutary effect, mental and physical.[6] Neither sexual pleasures nor drinking is totally disallowed.[7] In an ode it is said that anger which is worse than lust will vanish before the sparkling face of the devoted queen.[8] There are numerous references to the custom of taking liquor and sharing it with worthy guests. For example, Avvaiyār

[1] பிறரைத்தா னிரப்பறியல
னிரந்தோர்க்கு மறுப்பறியலன்
Puṟam, 239, ll. 8-9.

[2] *Ibid.*, 217, 251-2.

[3] Bk. viii, 3.

[4] Cf. ix, p. 37.

[5] வேட்டங் கடுஞ்சொன் மிகுதண்டஞ் சூதுபொரு
ளீட்டங்கட் காமமிவை யேழு.

The same stanza is quoted by Parimēlaḻagar in the commentary on the *Kuṟaḷ-veṇbā*, 566.

[6] Cf. *Puṟam*, 152.

[7] Cf. *Kāmandaki*, xiv, 21-6, 43-61.

[8] *Puṟam*, 6.

was offered wine by the chieftain Adigamāṉ.[1] Gambling also was in vogue. The gambling instrument is known as *nāy*. It was commonly done in the public hall of the village or city.[2] It appears that this was a hobby not only with the royal chieftains, but also with learned Brahmanas. Sometimes both the prince and the Brahmana engaged themselves in it. We have a classical instance of Māvaḷattāṉ, brother of Nalaṅkiḷḷi engaged in gambling with the Brahmana Kaṇṇaṉ.[3] We shall conclude this section by quoting an informing verse of the *Puṟapporuḷ veṇbāmālai*.[4] In this stanza the poet puts in a nut-shell what is expected of a true king. It runs, 'Oh king, you have taken possession of the battlefield having understood the two (good action and bad action) by the one (knowledge *ātma*); you have controlled the three (ally, enemy and neutral: or the three-fold *śakti, prabhu, utsāha* and *mantra*) and have conquered the four-fold division of the army (or the four means of *sāma, dāna, bhēda* and *daṇḍa*). May Your Majesty, the conqueror of the world surrounded on all sides by the ocean, live long and happy, having overcome the five (five senses) expanded the six (the six limbs of sovereignty or the *ṣāḍguṇyam*)[5] and avoided the seven (vices)'.

[1] See *supra*, pp. 66-7; cf. *Puṟam*, 56.
[2] *Puṟam*, 52.
[3] *Ibid*, 43.
[4] ஒன்றி விரண்டாய்ந்து மூன்றடக்கி நான்கினால்
வென்று களங்கொண்ட வேல்வேந்தே—சென்றுலா
மாழ்கடல்சூழ் வையகத்து ளைந்துவென் றாறகற்றி
யேழ்கடிந் தின்புற் றிரு. (225)
[5] An old stanza quoted by the commentator runs thus:—
நாடிய நட்புப் பகைசெலவு நல்லிருக்கை
கூடி னரைப்பிரித்தல் கூட்டலாறு.
The Sanskrit parallel may be:—

सन्धिविग्रहासनयानसंश्रयद्वैधीभावाष्षाड्गुण्यम् ॥

Arthaśāstra, Bk. vii, ch. 1.

Sec. VI. THE COUNCIL

A group of eighteen officials.—The remark has been already made[1] that the king's policy was controlled by a system of checks and balances, of which the Council was the chief factor. The *Piṅgalandai,* which, though comparatively a late work, is valuable as transmitting ancient Tamil tradition, makes the significant remark that a king was surrounded by eighteen different kinds of officials who aided him largely in carrying on the government.[2] These included the five constituents of the Council—the *mantrin,* the *purōhita,* the *sēnāpati,* the *dūta,* and the *cāra,* the group of eight officials—the Superintendent of the Accounts, the Head of the Executive, the Officer of the Treasury, the Chamberlain, the Representatives of the citizens, the Commander, the elephant-warriors, and horse-warriors,[3] and another group of five—Intimate friends, Brahmanas, Cooks, Physicians and Astrologers.[4]

The last five are said to be the *Uṟuticcuṟṟam.*[5]

The first five are said to be *mantiraccuṟṟam.*[6]

The two technical terms in this connection are *aimperuṅkuḻu* and *eṇpērāyam.* These terms occur jointly and severally in different places in the Śaṅgam literature.[7] The term *kuḻu* is only another term for *āyam.*

[1] See *supra,* p. 196.

[2] In the *pāyiram* of the *Ēlādi,* one of the works belonging to the category of the *Kīḻkkaṇakku*—an old commentator explains the term *Aṟunāḻvar* (அறுநாலவர்) in the introductory verse as the twenty-four officials and departments connected with the administration of the kingdom. Of these twenty-four, the same eighteen are given and the other six are the six limbs of sovereignty mentioned by the author of the *Kuṟal.*

[3] See *Divākaram;* also *Tamil Lexicon,* vol. i, pt. iii, p. 520.

[4] See the *Piṅgalandai,* ch. v, 44-7.

[5] உறுதிச்சுற்றம்.

[6] *Maṇi.,* xxviii, 1. 184.

[7] *Silap.,* iii, 126 v, 157; xxvi. 38; *Maṇi.,* 1. 17; *Peruṅkatai* ii. 5, 6; *Ibid.,* 13, 3; iv, 95; v. 6, 37.

Another interpretation of eṇpērāyam.—The term *eṇpērāyam,* otherwise known as *eṇperuntuṇaivar,* is commented on also in a different way, though loosely. These eight are those who adorned the king with a *tilaka* in his forehead, who decorated him with flowers, who presented to him undergarments and clothings, who offered him betel, who attended to his upper-dress, who offered him ghee and so on.[1] A reference to the supply of ghee to the king's household in Madura[2] shows that there must have been eight separate establishments, all catering for the needs of the royal household.[3] This interpretation seems to bear no political interest. Neither will this interpretation nor interpreting the term *āyam* as attendants on the queen fit in with the circumstances mentioned in the Śaṅgam classics. Most of these officials belonged to the royal *entourage* who followed the king in public tours, processions, festivals and similar occasions.[4]

The tīrthas of the Arthaśāstra.—The above three groups of officials, numbering eighteen, suggest a comparison with the eighteen departments of Government according to the Sanskritists. These departments are generally designated *tīrthas* and these are mantrin, purōhita, sēnāpati, yuvarāja, dauvārika or door-keeper, antarvaṁśika (chamberlain), praśāstā (secretary in charge of prisons), samāhartā (collector-general), sannidhātā (finance-minister), pradēṣṭṛ (chief police officer), nāyaka

[1] The term Kañjukaṉ occurs in the *Maṇimēkalai*, Canto, xxviii, l. 128.
[2] See Author's *Hindu Ad. Inst.*, pp. 161-2.
[3] *Silap.*, vii, l. 7.

'சாந்துபூக் கச்சாடை பாக்கிலை கஞ்சுகநெ
யாய்ந்த விவரெண்ம ராயத்தார்—வேந்தர்க்கு
மாசனம்பார்ப் பார்மருத்தர் வாழ்நிமித்த ரோடமைச்ச
ராசி லவைக்களத்தா ரைந்து'

[4] See also commentary of the *Silap.*, p. 147.

(leader of infantry), pauravyavahārika (judge at the capital), karmāntika (director of mines and industries), mantripariṣadadhyakṣa (secretary to the council assembly), daṇḍapāla (leader of the army corps), durgapāla (officer in charge of the fortresses), antapāla (frontier guards), and āṭavika (forest-chiefs.)[1] Dr. K. P. Jayaswal would separate paura and vyavahārika.[2] If this could be accepted, the paura may correspond to the *nagaramākkaḷ* or *nagaramāntar* of the Tamil literature. Most of these agree but some offices are different from the *tīrthas* of Sanskrit literature. The latter furnish a rough parallel at the most.

Passing on to the subject proper, we find the first group of the five (*aimperuṅkuḻu*) as the council of the king who invariably consulted it, and acted according to its decision.[3] This consisted of the Chief Minister, the Purōhita, the Commander-in-Chief, the Ambassador and the Intelligence Officer. It is not altogether correct to render the term *aimperuṅkuḻu* as five great bodies. We would interpret it as the important group of the five, the cabinet, to speak in terms of modern political science. Of these, reference has already been made to the Purōhita[4] and reference will be made in the following chapter to the Commander-in-Chief, the Ambassador and the Intelligence Officer. The *mantrin* is the Chief Minister and this implies that there were other ministers or *amātyas*. On the qualifications of the minister, the *Maduraikkāñci* says: 'A true minister shall note the good and the bad in the king and advise him to conduct himself with love and righteousness and thus keep him in the right path so that nothing would be said of him (the minister) and so that

1 *Arthaśāstra*, Book i, 12.
2 *Hindu Polity*, pt. ii, pp. 133-4.
3 For another view, see K. A. Nīlakaṇṭha Śāstri, the *Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, pp. 32-3.
4 See *supra*, pp. 194-5.

the king's fame may spread throughout the kingdom."[1] The term *kāvidi* in the passage quoted suggests that this description has reference more to the finance minister. When Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ set out on his northern expedition in the auspicious hour fixed by the astrologer, among those who accompanied him and blessed the undertaking were the *aimperuṅkuḻu* and the *eṇpērāyam*. On the eve of his march the king called for a conference of his officials and spoke to them of his resolution. On this the *āśāṉ* (*purōhita*) and the *mantikaṉ* (*mauhūrtika*) addressed him and agreed with him.[2] What is remarkable is that in the Council chamber, the queen also was present and took part in the deliberations.[3] The other officers mentioned in the *Śilappadikāram* are the chief executive officers (*karumaviṉaiñar*),[4] accountants (*kaṇakkiyal viṉaiñar*), judges (*tarumaviṉaiñar*), army officers (*tantiraviṉaiñar*) and the astrologer (*peruṅkaṇi*).[5] In another place we have the mention of the following officers, *āśāṉ* (*purōhita*), *peruṅkaṇi* (astrologer), *arakkaḷattantaṇar* (judges), *kāvidi* (revenue officers), *mantirakkaṇakkar* (counsellors).[6] The last are also called *mantiraccuṟṟam*.

The passage in the *Puṟam*[7] and the comment on it certainly lend support to the view we have taken that the king

[1] நன்றுந் தீதுங் கண்டாய்ந் தடக்கி
யன்பு மறனு மொழியா தாத்துப்
பழியொரீஇ யுயர்ந்து பாய்புகழ் நிறைந்த
செம்மை சான்ற காவிதி மாக்கள். ll. 496-99.

[2] See *Śilap.* the opening lines of the *kālkōṭkādai*, xxvi.

[3] *Ibid.*, xxv, ll. 107-14; xxviii, ll. 65-6.

[4] கரும வினைஞருங் கணக்கியல் வினைஞருந்
தரும வினைஞருந் தந்திர வினைஞரும். *Śilap.*, xxvi, ll. 40-41.

[5] xxii, ll. 8-9.

[6] அறக்களத் தந்தண ராசான் பெருங்கணி Cf. *Ibid*, xxviii, ll. 221-2.

[7] 'திரியாச் சுற்றமொடு முழுதுசேண் விளங்கி' *Puṟam*, 2, l. 19.

had a Council which he consulted before taking any final action. As the policy of the State was dependent on their advice and guidance, utmost care was taken to appoint suitable men for these responsible posts. The ministers are known as *kalaikkaṇṇāḷar*,[1] (i.e.) those who possess the eye of knowledge. The term *kalaikkaṇṇāḷār* perhaps answers to the expression *jñānacakṣuḥ* of the *Arthaśāstra*. It is said there were sixty-four branches of learning. The ministers were expected to have learnt all this to effectively handle and direct the machinery of government. Mere theoretical knowledge was not enough. They should be practical men of the world and should be also aged enough to bring their mature experience to bear on the policy of the State.[2]

Sec. VII. THE DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION.

Though there is not much material available in the ancient literature of the Tamils for constructing a history of the department of finance under the Tamil kings of those days, still, there are some terms and expressions which, if properly interpreted and understood, would go a long way to make out a case for this important institution. It needs no saying that a State could not go on without finances, and no finance would be sound if it be not properly managed and controlled. That the management of this department was vested in a body of officials who went by the name *kāvidi* is evident from the *Śilappadikāram*.[3] From the circumstances in which the term is mentioned, it is reasonable to assume that the *kāvidi* was the chief

[1] கலைக் கண்ணாளர், *Cintāmaṇi*, 19-24.

[2] See Paṇḍit Swāminātha Aiyar: சங்கத் தமிழும் பிற்காலத் தமிழும், p. 109. For other qualifications of the minister see *Ēlādi* (17) : also *Śiṟupañcamūlam*, 58.

[3] xxii, *Alarpaḍukādai*, 1. 9; cf. *Perunkalai*, ii. 3, 144.

finance minister whose headquarters was at the capital and whose chief duty was probably to see that the revenues due were collected in season and in the proper way. The *kāvidi* can be compared to the *sannidhātā* or the *samāhartā* of the *Arthaśāstra*. According to the *Śilappadikāram*, he is one of the five chief officers of the State who advised and were advised in turn by the king on great affairs affecting the kingdom. Aḻumbil-vēḷ seems to have been the finance minister of Cēraṉ Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ. The king ordered him to go with his establishment *āyakkaṇakkar* round the country and proclaim in his name remission of taxes in honour of the founding of the temple to Kaṇṇaki.[1] Yet another term *karaṇaltiyalavar*, one among the *eṇpērāyam* points to another class of officials connected with taxation and finance. It is rather difficult to make out the specific duties assigned to these two classes of officials, though it is plausible to argue that they had different functions to discharge.

Sources of Revenue.—The Tamiḻagam was chiefly an agricultural country and hence a considerable portion of the revenue came from the land, which was generally one-sixth of the produce. What is noteworthy is that Sanskrit texts mention the same rate.[2] The *Kuṟaḷ* says how one should distribute his income remaining after the payment of the recognized one-sixth to the king,

தென்புலத்தார் தெய்வம் விருந்தொக்க லுனென்றாங்
கைம்புலத்தா றோம்பல் தலை. (43) Cf. *Puṟam*, 17.

[1] *Śilap.*, canto xxviii, ll. 204-6.

Note.—Incidentally both the *Peruṅkatai* and the commentary of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar on the *Sūtra* 129 of the *Tolkāppiyam* furnish that similar titles which were awarded by the king were not uncommon. As an example, the term Eṭṭi (எட்டி) is given to select merchants and the *Maṇimēkalai* has reference to *eṭṭikumaraṉ* (எட்டிகுமரன்) (iv. 58).

[2] See *Hindu Adm. Insti.*, p. 163.

among the five persons—the departed manes, gods, guests, relatives and self.

The *Puṟapporuḷ Veṇbāmālai* which mentions the same rate of the one-sixth[1] promulgates the important theory of protection and taxation. In other words the taxes to the king are regarded as wages paid to him for the protection he affords, and if occasion rose, the people might cease to pay the taxes and apply to the king for remission. An instance in point is that a poet Nāgaṉār who was an agriculturist by profession, found the economic law of diminishing returns operating in his fields, and knowing that he could not get justice from the lower officials, approached the Cōḻa king Kiḷḷivaḷavaṉ and pleaded his cause before him. After hearing what the poet said, he ordered remission of revenue.[2]

The other source of revenue was commerce. The existence of big mercantile communities like Ippar, Kavippar, Peruṅkuḍi, dealing in active commerce both by sea and land, the fact that these merchants were the wealthiest community of the times, and also the fact of the king awarding them title like the *Eṭṭi,* go to demonstrate a flourishing condition of trade. The *Paṭṭiṉappālai* refers to the Customs Officers who were in charge of commodities exported to, and imported from, foreign lands. There were toll-houses where tolls, varying according to the nature and quality of the articles, were levied by special officials appointed for the purpose.[3] Vaḷḷuvar mentions this income as one of the three sources

உறுபொருளு முல்கு பொருளுந்தன் னொன்னார்த்
தெறுபொருளும் வேந்தன் பொருள். *Kuraḷ-veṇbā,* 756.

[1] ஊறின் றுவகையுள் வைக வுயிரோம்பி
யாறிலொன் றுறு தளித்துண்டு—மாறின்றி
வான்காவல் கொண்டான் வழிநின்று வைகலுந்
தான்காவல் கொண்ட றகும். (179)

[2] See *Puṟam,* 35

[3] *Ibid.,* 120-37.

which go to the king legitimately. The other two are those coming from mines and spoils of war. We may here draw attention to the special act of the Pāṇḍyan Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ who, on a representation from a young and poor poet, who suddenly grew wealthy by rich presents from an unexpected quarter, for which the lower officials meted out to him unjust punishment, ordered that in his kingdom, treasure-finds and other legitimately acquired income belonged, of right, to the discoverer. What we have to note specially is the relinquishing by the king of his right to treasure-troves.[1] Other important sources of income which swelled the king's treasury[2] are the spoils of war, tributes and voluntary contributions. That the first two were normal, is seen from several poems of the *Puṟam*.[3] Occasional and voluntary contributions especially by the hill-tribes both in kind and in cash were another good source of income. The *Śilappadikāram* mentions that, when king Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ passed through the Nilgiris, many a present was given to him by the hill-men.[4] There were certainly other sources of revenue as testified to by the inscriptions of the Pallavas, Pāṇḍyas and Cōḻas. These are not examined here as the scope of the book has been mainly restricted to Tamil literature. Suffice it to say that the various sources of revenue mentioned above are only reminiscences of an earlier epoch, and hence most of them are undoubtedly ancient forms of taxation.

Principles of Taxation.—The king was either a righteous or an unrighteous tax-gatherer. Unrighteous methods of collecting taxes are condemned in unequivocal terms.

[1] இடுபொரு ளாயினும் படுபொரு ளாயினு
முற்றவர்க் குறுதி பெற்றவர்க் காமென *Śilap.*, canto xxiii, ll. 128-9.

[2] For the treasury see *Śiṟupañcamūlam*, 40.

[3] See for example 22, ll. 25-7; 97, ll. 19-21; 387, ll. 12-13.

[4] Canto xxv, ll. 35-55.

The first and the equitable method is applauded. In this connection we can recall an informing ode in the *Puṛam*. It says that even though the extent of the land is less than a *mā*, if one would make a ball of dried paddy and continue to offer it to an elephant every day, it would be possible for him to continue the same for a long time to come. On the other hand, if the extent of the land is more than a hundred *śey*, and if an elephant is allowed to eat of it at its will, the amount of waste caused by the crushing of the grains under its feet will be very much more than what it would ordinarily consume. In the same way if an intelligent king would gather moderate and equitable taxes, his treasury will grow a thousand-fold and he himself will get recognition and fame. If, on the other hand, the king lacks wisdom and is surrounded by officers who are not versed in the equitable path but support him in whatever way he goes, and levies reckless imposts from his subjects, like the elephant that entered the paddy-store, he will not himself enjoy, and the State will be reduced to the verge of ruin.[1] In another ode of the same anthology (75) the term *'kuḍipuṛavirakkum Kūrilāṇmais-śiṛiyōṉ'* refers to the ignoble king who asks for more than the usual and fixed one-sixth part of the revenue.[2] Quite appropriate to this prescription is that of the *Kuṛaḷ*

[1] காய்நெல் லறுத்துக் கவளங் கொளினே
மாநிறை வில்லதும் பன்னாட் காகு
நூறுசெறு வாயினுந் தமித்துப்புக் குணினே
வாய்புகு வதனினுங் கால்பெரிது கெடுக்கு
மறிவுடை வேந்த னெறியறிந்து கொளினே
கோடி யாத்து நாடுபெரிது நந்து
மெல்லியன் கிழவ னாகி வைகலும்
வரிசை யறியாக் கல்லென் சுற்றமொடு
பரிவுதப வெடுக்கும் பிண்ட நச்சின்
யானை புக்க புலம்போலத்
தானு முண்ணா னுலகமுங் கெடுமே. *Puṛam*, 184.

[2] Cf. 197, ll. 15-19.

which compares a king backed by the power of his *daṇḍa* asking for more money than what is due, to a highway robber with a sword in his hand asking a lonely traveller to surrender all his possessions.[1]

Items of Expenditure.—With regard to items of expenditure, we know definitely two items. One is the enormous money spent by the State on irrigation. The other was presents to the worthy and the deserving. The king whose interest in irrigation was great, was Karikārcōlaṉ. In addition to the several literary evidences, there is the certain evidence of epigraphical testimony[2] that Karikālaṉ raised substantial embankments for the river Kāviri for the purpose of irrigation. In speaking about the achievements of the same monarch, the *Paṭṭiṉappālai*, a Śaṅgam work, refers to his construction of tanks and wells and to such other productive works thus converting the jungle into an inhabitable country.[3]

With regard to the second item, we know the liberality of these Tamil kings who awarded gifts to the poets and poetesses who looked for their patronage. In fact every king celebrated in the Śaṅgam anthologies, is celebrated for his munificence. Besides cash which was the usual form of gifts, the grant of *brahmadēya* lands was also in practice. According to the *Padiṟṟuppattu* the Cēra king awarded such *piramadēya* lands to the poet Kumaṭṭūrkkaṇṇaṉār.[4] This was, in other words, the means to realize the two ends of the State, viz. education and religion, on which depends the progress of society.

1 *வேலொடு நின்றா னிடுவென் றதுபோலுங்*
கோலொடு நின்றா னிரவு. (552)

2 *Ep. Ind.*, vii, p. 125.

3 l. 284 f.

4 II padikam. Cf. *Ar. Śās* on the gifts of *brahmadēya* lands to the *Śrōtriyas*, *ṛtviks* and *Purōhitas*.

Other items of expenditure connected with the royal household, the civil and military establishments, and other undertakings of a productive or unproductive character, we know little about. Unfortunately we do not have enough materials which could throw light on these and other topics of interest connected with fiscal administration.

Sec. VIII. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The Concept of Law.—Law as understood to-day is quite different from the conception of law in ancient Tamil India. Law to the ancient Indians, whether of the north or the south of India, was the customary law, the law of diverse peoples. There was in fact no legislature which made and unmade laws. In very ancient times, the king represented the State as the administrator, as the leader of hosts in war and as the judge. But with the expansion of the State, arose other institutions. A need was felt for the distribution of power among institutions which shouldered the responsibility in behalf of the State. One among such institutions was the department of Justice. The king entrusted the work of administering justice to a body of officials who were held responsible for the proper conduct of justice. Invariably the members of this body were Brahmanas, and the Hall of Justice was called *aṟak-kaḷam.*[1] This term is rendered *tarumāśaṉam* (*Sans. Dharmāsana*) by the commentator.

A High Sense of Justice.—The pregnant observation of the author of the *Kuṟaḷ,* namely, that it is not the lance[2] that gains victory but only a righteous administration

[1] அறக்களத்தந்தணர். *Silap.*, cant. xxii, ll. 8, 26, 246; xxviii, l. 222.

[2] வேலன்று வென்றி தருவது மன்னவன்
கோலதூஉங் கோடா தெனின். *Kuṟaḷ-veṇbā,* 546.

that contributes to success, is corroborated by the *Puram* where the observance of the dharmaic rule is said to be essential to, and incumbent on a king.[1]

In more than one place in the *Śilappadikāram*, it is said that, if justice was not properly meted out, the king would not survive it.[2] In fact this is mentioned as the chief characteristic of the Pāṇḍyan kings.[3] With such a high sense of justice, then, the ancient Tamil kings left no stone unturned for meting out proper justice to the wronged and the innocent. There was a special department of justice, composed of highly learned Brahmanas well versed in Śāstraic lore. The king was of course the High Court of Appeal. The *Kuṛaḷ* prescribes:

> 'Search out, to no one favour show, with heart that justice loves
> Consult, then act: this is the rule that right approves.'
> 'Hard of access, nought searching out, with partial hand,
> The king who rules, shall sink and perish from the land.'

These two *Kuṛaḷ-veṇbās*[4] concisely state on what lines the administration of justice is to be conducted. Awarding punishment without a searching inquiry into the whole case, showing special favour to one party or the other, are severely condemned. In the *Kuṛaḷ* polity the king was still the judge, though he consulted

[1] அறநெறி முதற்றே யரசின் கொற்றம். *Puram*. 55, 10.
[2] செங்கோல் வளைய வுயிர்வா ழாமை. *Śilap*. Canto xxviii, 212-3.
[3] *Ibid., Canto*. xxix, p. 577.
[4] ஓர்ந்துகண் ணோடா திறைபுரிந் தியார்மாட்டுந்
தேர்ந்துசெய் வஃதே முறை. *Kuṛaḷ-veṇbā*, 54.
எண்பதத்தா னோரா முறைசெய்யா மன்னவன்
றண்பதத்தாற் றானே கெடும். *Ibid.*, 548.

beforehand men learned in law. Impartiality is insisted upon. The king should so administer justice that he might win the love and esteem of the people. Easy accessibility, patient hearing and right punishment are the qualities of a righteous monarch.

'The king bestowed sympathetic thought on those who desired justice to be done to them and got the grievances of others righted as wished for by them.'[1]

Again: 'If the king, who is easily accessible to his citizens and acts in accordance with the established law of the land would but desire, rains will instantaneously pour in.'[2]

The sabhā at Uṛaiyūr.—But by the time the epics were composed, a separate department of justice had come into being.[3] We have the mention of the *sabhā* at Uṛaiyūr, the Cōḻa capital, as a model Court of Justice. We have the testimony of an ancient poet Māṛōkkattu-Nappaśalaiyār in an ode in the *Puṛam*.[4]

Thus the *sabhā* at Uṛaiyūr must be considered very ancient, where justice was administered according to the established laws.

1 முறைவேண்டுநர்க்குங் குறைவேண்டுநர்க்கும்
வேண்டுப வேண்டுப வேண்டினர்க் கருளி
(*Perumpāṇ*, ll. 443-4.)

2 முறைவேண்டு பொழுதிற் பதனெளி யோரீண்
டுறைவேண்டு பொழுதிற் பெயல்பெற் றோரே. *Puṛam*, 35.
Cf. *Mutumoḻikāñci*, x, (10) *Elādi*, (11) *Kuṛaḷ-veṇbā*, 386 and 559.

3 *Silap.*, canto v, ll. 135-8.

4 மறங்கெழு சோழ ருறந்தை யவையத்
தறநின்று நிலையிற் றாகலி னதனான்
முறைமையின் புகழு மன்றே. *Puṛam*. 39, ll. 8-10.
அறங்கெழு சோழ ருறந்தை யவையத்
தறங்கெட வறியா தாங்கு. *Naṟṟiṇai*, 400, ll. 7-8.
ஆரங் கண்ணி யடுபோர்ச் சோழ
ரறங்கெழு நல்லவை யுறந்தை யன்ன. *Aham*, 93, ll. 4-5.

Capital Punishment.—We know of cases where punishment was awarded without thorough investigation and which cost not only the monarch's life but the ruin of his whole capital city. When Kōvalan took his wife's anklet for sale to the market, the State goldsmith placed him in safe custody and informed the king that the anklet resembled the one that was lost in the palace. Without going into the merits of the case, the king at once ordered his execution. Even the executioners hesitated for some time before they performed the unpleasant and unholy task entrusted to them. But the royal order must be obeyed. Poor Kōvalan was executed. When his wife Kaṇṇaki came to know of this, she ran with breathless haste to the Durbar hall, and so proved the innocence of her husband that the Pāṇḍyan king fell down from the throne broken-hearted, for having committed a great blunder by inflicting capital punishment on the innocent.[1]

An Incident from Karikāla's Life.—Karikārcōlan came to the throne when very young. Once, two old men, the plaintiff and the defendant came to his palace to prefer a complaint before him. Finding the king too young and inexperienced, they preferred to place their case before the Court of Justice. Hence they withdrew from the palace and sought the aid of the Law Court. Here the king appeared disguised in the attire of an old man and sat on the judgment seat. The two men were not able to recognize that he was the king himself in the guise of a judge. He then gave his judgment which pleased both the plaintiff and the defendant.[2] Whether these examples are historically true or otherwise, they are

[1] *Silap*. canto xvi, l. 115 ff.

[2] See the *Palamoli* (21) and the commentary thereon. See also, *Maṇi*. iv, ll. 107-8; *Porunarārruppaḍai*, ll. 187-8.

valuable in so far as they portray the ideas prevalent in those days, and the conception of the administration of justice as a sacred trust with the kings.

A Court of Justice.—It is evident that there was then a Court of Justice known as *maṉṟam*,[1] *avai*,[2] *avaikkaḷam*,[3] the *sabhā* of Sanskrit literature, in the chief cities where both civil and criminal causes were taken cognizance of, tried, and decided. We have, however, no materials to show whether there were separate courts for civil suits and for criminal causes. But it is just possible that there was more than one *maṉṟam* in one and the same city. But this by itself cannot prove the existence of separate courts. It is more reasonable to hold the view that the same court dealt with both kinds of causes. The judges were largely guided by what is known as *dharmanūl*,[4] and as *nūl* is *śāstra*, the *dharmanūl* may be some *Dharmaśāstra*, as the judges were of the Brahmana community. What Dr. Jayaswal has remarked[5] about the Brahmana judge of Hindu Administration will be equally applicable to the Tamil Administration. He says: 'Law proper and Law ecclesiastical in administration tended to unite into one and unite in the hand of the Brahmana judge. And the Brahmana was fairly above the influence of the king.'

Other Officers.—The other officers belonging to this department are not mentioned in sufficient detail. There is however warrant for the assumption that there was a Superintendent of the Jail, from the mention of the terms[6] meaning Jail in an ode of the *Puṟam* (74) and the twin epics.[7] That there were Jail guards and that great

[1] *Puṟam*, 89, 135, etc., [2] *Ibid.*, 39; [3] *Ibid.*, 71, l. 8 and 83, l. 3.
[4] *Ibid.*, 15 and 34.
[5] *Hindu Polity*, ii, p. 153.
[6] சிறை, சிறைக் கோட்டம்.
[7] *Silap*, xxiii, 103; *Maṇi*, canto xix, l. 133, etc.

restrictions were placed on the Jail officers in regard to the treatment of prisoners is evident from an ode in the *Puram*[1] and the colophon to it. According to this, the king Cēramān Kaṉaikkāl Irumporai who was defeated and taken prisoner by the Cōḻan Śeṅgaṇāṉ was interned at the penitentiary in the Kuḍavāyiṟ Kōṭṭam. Asking for water when thirsty and not getting it in time, he refused to drink the water offered later on by the officers, but went on hunger strike and died.

Release of Prisoners.—A noteworthy point in this connection is the release of prisoners. It would appear that a general amnesty was declared on the occasion of the celebration of the birthday of the king.[2] This birthday is designated as *Perunāḷ*[3] and *Perumaṅgalam.*[4] Such general amnesty was also granted on other similar occasions. For example, on the occasion of the founding of the temple for Pattiṉidēvi, Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ ordered the release of State prisoners like Kaṉaka and Vijaya as well as other ordinary prisoners.[5]

Offences and Punishments.—There were offences of a civil character. One was failure to repay the debts incurred, as will be seen from a reference in the *Śiṟu-*

[1] குழவி யிறப்பினு மூன்றடி பிறப்பினு
மாளன் றென்று வாளிற் றப்பார்
தொடர்ப்படு ஞமலியி னிடர்ப்படுத் திரீஇய
கேளல் கேளிர் வேளாண் சிறுபத
மதுகை யின்றி வயிற்றுத்தீத் தணியத்
தாமிரந் துண்ணு மளவை
யீன்ம ரோவிவ் வுலகத் தானே.

சேரமான் கணைக்காலிரும்பொறை சோழன் செங்கணானோடு திருப்போர்ப் புறத்துப் பொருது பற்றுக்கோட்பட்டுக் குடவாயிற் கோட்டத்துச் சிறையிற் கிடந்து தண்ணீர் தாவென்று பெறாது பெயர்த்துப் பெற்றுக் கைக்கொண்டிருந்து உண்ணான் சொல்லித் துஞ்சிய பாட்டு.

[2] *Maṇi.*, canto xxviii, 9.
[3] *Silap.*, canto xxvii, 44.
[4] *Tol. Poruḷ*, 91.
[5] *Silap.*, canto xxviii, ll. 204-5.

pañcamūlam,[1] one of the eighteen poems in the category of *Kīḻkkaṇakku.* Among the criminal offences were theft, adultery, treason or *rājadrōha,* assault and so forth. The punishments were of different kinds such as imprisonment,[2] mutilation of limbs, and sentence of death. In the age of the *Śilappadikāram,* there was in existence a treatise on theft, *Karavaṭu.* To this the executioners of Kōvalaṉ make a reference. Two examples of expert thieves are mentioned. One night a thief dressed in a woman's attire, entered the bed-room of the brother of king Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ, without anybody's knowledge, in the shadow caused by the lights in the palace. When the prince was fast asleep, he removed the diamond-necklace from his body; immediately the prince woke up and unsheathed his sword in the dark. Getting hold of the sheath, the thief skilfully managed the thrusting of the sword into the sheath, though aimed at him. Finding this, the prince engaged him in a wrestling fight, when the thief drew him near a pillar of the room and disappeared. No one knew, how or where. The other instance is that of a thief who was dark in colour and appeared in the dead of night and got hold of a man who unsheathed his sword. The thief managed to get hold of the sword, and ran away with it.[3]

Treachery to the king was visited with equally severe punishments.[4] For committing adultery the punishment

[1] ஒன்றூனுங் கண்டிழி நாச்சாம். (10)

[2] பிழைத்தாரை யொறுக்குந் தண்டத் தறுசிறைக் கோட்டம்.

Maṇi xix. ll. 42-43.

[3] *Śilap.* canto xvi, ll. 190-212. For a description of a thief and his implements see *Maduraikkāñci,* ll. 639-42.

[4] There is a case of suspicion of treason. Poet Iḷandattaṉ was suspected of being a spy and the Cōḻa king ordered his execution. His innocence being proved, he was left alone. *Puṟam,* 47, cf. 46.

was to cut off the offender's legs.[1] Even the great moralist statesman Tiruvaḷḷuvar accepts and approves the sentence of death so that criminal offences might be minimised.[2]

It would thus appear that capital punishments were in vogue and were put in operation only when the nature of the case called for the same. Otherwise, punishments were equitable and mild, and based on law and custom.[3] It is remarkable to note that offences committed by a Brahmana were not visited with such severe punishments. When Māvaḷattāṉ, brother of prince Nalaṅkiḷḷi and the Brahmana Kaṇṇaṉār were engaged in a game of dice, and when the latter did not play a straight game, the prince grew angry and reprimanded the Brahmana. On this, the latter made the significant remark that none of his predecessors had treated the Brahmanas in the manner in which he did. The prince realized his mistake and asked for pardon for having done so unwittingly.[4] This is mentioned here, only to show the regard and the esteem in which the Brahmana was held in Tamil India.

Witnesses.—When a certain case was presented to the Court, one method of enquiry was by the examination of witnesses. There were then, as now, both false and true witnesses. The *Śiṛupañcamūlam* condemns the witness who deposes to an untruth.[5] The false witness is mentioned as one among the six offenders of a State. The other five are—pseudo-sannyāsins, housewives loose in morals, disloyal ministers, adulterers and tale-bearers.[6] In different places in the *Śilappadikāram*,

1 காணிற் குடிப்பழியாங் கையுறிற் கால்குறையும். Nāladiyār, 84.

2 கொலையிற் கொடியாரை வேந்தொறுத்தல் பைங்கூழ்
களைகட் டதனொடு நேர். *Kuraḷ-venbā*, 550.

3 ஒழுக்கம் (Sans. *ācāra*) and வழக்கு (Sans. *vyavahāra*) see *Puram*, 10.

4 *Puram*, 43.

5 கொடுங்கரிப் போவானுஞ் சாம். (10)

6 *Silap*, canto v, 11. 128-34.

deposing as false witness is treated as a great crime. Thus we see how carefully justice was administered in ancient Tamil India and the dignity of law and order maintained.

Sec. IX. VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION

Political Divisions.—The village which is known by different names such as ūr, pērūr, (big village) mūdūr, (old village) śiṛūr (small village) is the unit of administration in the Tamil polity. Sometimes one village and sometimes a group of villages formed the unit of administration. A number of such villages or their groups constituted a *nāḍu*. Above this was the territorial division of the *maṇḍilam*. The *maṇḍilam* connoted the geographical limits covered by the central administration. Between the *nāḍu* and the *maṇḍilam*, there was another political division of the territory *Kūṟṟam* or *Kōṭṭam* (district). Invariably on the border limits of the *maṇḍilam* lived subordinate kings who are known as the *vēḷir*. These subordinate kings are called *Kuṟunila-maṉṉarkaḷ.* These were smaller chieftains who enjoyed semi-independence for they were subject to the suzerainty of the king at the capital. The latter is designated as *kō* or *muḍivēndaṉ.*

The Village, a Self-contained Unit.—Every village was a self-contained unit. Agriculture was of course the main profession of the people. Mere agriculture could not make the village economically independent of other villages. So, cottage industries were a special feature. There was, then, a division of the whole people of the village into occupational or functional groups which became in course of time hereditary and which consequently assumed the status of separate castes. In the *Puṟam,* Māṅguḍi Kiḻār makes a reference to some occupational castes—tuḍiyaṉ (a player on the drum

denominated *tuḍi*), pāṉaṉ (bard), paṛaiyaṉ (drummer) and kaḍambaṉ, (an agriculturist). To these the *Perumpāṇārṛuppaḍai* adds fisherman (*valaiyar*), traders and merchants (*vaṇikar*), and cultivating labourers (*uḻavar*). The early organizations were, then, communal in character, and all the different groups engaged in various trades and professions contributed to the growth of the great village community, an institution which is regarded as something unique by the modern political theorist.

How the village community functioned effectively and efficiently in the realms of social, political, economic and religious life of the village is evident from the monumental reports of the Madras Epigraphist. The South Indian inscriptions often draw our attention to such institutions with full details of their organization and administration. These have not been pressed into service here inasmuch as these portray a state of society long posterior to the sixth century after Christ, an epoch outside the pale of the Śaṅgam. As the present study is mainly confined to Śaṅgam age, we refrain from making an elaborate use of the inscriptions.[1]

Details of Village Administration.—Confining ourselves, then, to the data furnished by the Śaṅgam literature, we find only one feature of the village administration, namely, the administration of justice. We have not sufficient materials for determining the political relations between the Central Government and the Local Government represented by these tiny republics of village communities. It would appear that the village community agreed to make a fixed annual contribution to the Central Executive; and so long as this was forthcoming regularly, there was no need for interference on the part of the

[1] I have utilized the data furnished by epigraphy in my *Hindu Administrative Institutions*, chap. vii, secs. iv. and v.

Central Government with the internal management of the village. Indeed the village enjoyed absolute autonomy in the management of its internal affairs with the help of the village elders[1] who formed themselves into various committees for supervising particular interests like gardens, tanks, etc. The village affairs were settled by the unanimous decision of the elders who generally assembled under a big tree. The assembly thus convened is called *manram*, and also *Podiyil*.[2] Four kinds of trees are mentioned as relating to a *manram*. In fact the *manram* takes its name from that particular tree under which it is located. These are Irattimanram (jujube),[3] vilāmanram[4] (wood-apple), palāmanram[5] (jack), and Vēppamanram[6] (margosa). This does not mean that only under these trees were the *manrams* held. As a matter of fact, there is the mention of the assemblage of the Kōśar underneath the shade of an old banyan tree with thick branches spreading in all directions.[7] Generally, this tree was in front of the village.[8] In some places it was also in the centre of the village.[9] *Manram* simply means a public place. It was put to different uses. First, it was the common pasturage of the village where cattle were allowed to graze.[10] Secondly, it served as the village theatre

[1] The term *Kilār* appended to a certain village and mentioned, as the name of a poet or chieftain, suggests the idea of that poet or chieftain being the head of that village or group of villages. *Kilān* literally means the magnate. In the *Puram* anthology, we meet with a number of such names. Some of them may be mentioned. Ariśil-kilār, Alattūr-kilār, Āvūr-kilār, Idaik-kunrūr-kilār, Kārikilār, Kuruń-kōliyūr-kilār, Kūdalūr-kilār, Kōvūr kilār are poets and bards. Eruntūrkilān, Karumbanūr-kilān, Konkānań-kilān and Cōlanāttuppitavūr-kilār were chieftains. Apparently most of these poets were elders of the village, pursuing their hereditary professions. The chieftains were perhaps the heads of these villages.

[2] *Puram*, 34, 128 and 390.
[3] *Puram*, 34, l. 12, 325, ll. 10-11.
[4] *Ibid.*, 181.
[5] *Ibid.*, 128 ll. 1-2.
[6] *Ibid.*, 76, l. 4.
[7] See also *Kuruntogai*, 15; Aham, 251, l. 8.
[8] *Puram* 390, l. 19.
[9] *Tirumuru*, l. 226.
[10] *Aham*, 14; *Puram*, 387.

and the dancing hall.[1] Thirdly, it was a place often frequented by the members of the fair sex who participated in the social enjoyments of the village. It is said that when once their husbands were dead, the women ceased going there.[2]

The village assembly met to hear causes and award punishment according to the gravity of the offence. Other affairs of local importance also came under its jurisdiction. The members were generally the elders of the village in whom the people of the village had absolute confidence on account of their integrity and impartiality. This is testified to by no less a poet than Peruṅkuṉṟūrkiḻār in addressing the Cōḻa king Iḷañjēṭceṉṉi.[3]

The *maṉṟam* was then a village sabhā or council where the village business was transacted by the villagers themselves, an extension of the true principle of democratic government.

Even the safeguarding of the village from robbers and other undesirables, rested chiefly with the village community. There was an excellent system of night-watchmen who were entrusted with the guardianship of the village during nights. They generally went round the streets of the village with lights in their hands at dead of night.[4]

Not only was the protection and defence of the village, but also the proper maintenance and upkeep carefully attended to. It seems that grain-dealers and other merchants often passed through these roads with costly merchandise. Lest they should be waylaid and plundered by highway robbers, it is said that these paths were

[1] *Maduraikkāñci*, 1. 615. [2] *Puram*, 373, 1. 12.

[3] *Ibid.*, 266, ll. 9-10.

[4] இடங்கருங் குட்டத் துடன்வெருக் கொடி
யாமங் கொள்பவர் சுடர்நிழற் கதூஉம். (*Puram*, 37, ll. 8-9.)

made safe and secure by posting special watchmen in these places, the cost of which was probably met from the toll-dues collected at the toll-houses.[1]

Thus we have passed in rapid review a system of polity, not complex in character, in vogue in very early times in the southernmost part of the vast Indian Continent. At the first glance there appears no material difference, except in certain matters of detail, between this South Indian polity and the far more ancient Hindu polity of North India. When we remember and recognize the fact that there was frequent intercourse between the North and the South and a free interchange of ideas and ideals, ever since the time of the composition of the *Ṛgvēda Saṁhitā* in which occurs the word *Dakṣiṇāpatha*, we would cease to wonder at these parallel developments of many of the component parts of the administrative machinery. Like the Ganges and the Jumna, these two streams of ancient culture, though separate in their origin and separate in the early part of their course, became afterwards united into a single river, containing the essential elements and salient features of both, whose perennial waters still continue not only to fertilize the soil which it flows over, but also to contribute a rich quota to the sea of speculative thought and political philosophy.

[1] *Perumpāṇ*, ll. 80-82; *Ibid.* 39-41.

CHAPTER VI

THE ART OF WAR

Sec. I. INTRODUCTORY

WRITERS on the history of English literature remark justly and truly that the writings of a certain epoch preserve and represent the feelings and sentiments, the ideas and ideals, tendencies and beliefs of that particular period. If this were true of English literature, it is largely so of other literatures as well. 'Literature' says Alfred Lyall 'may be employed by the critic and the historian as a delicate instrument for analysis, for investigating the psychology of the man and of his period, for laying bare the springs of thought and action which underlie and explain history.'[1] It is in the province of research to arrive at this historical fact. In this way only much of the history of ancient Greece and of ancient India is to be reconstructed. The history of South India in pre-historic periods is largely taken from the abundant wealth of Tamil literature—the one great source of information.

In Tamil literature, however, there are no systematic treatises as in Sanskrit, specially treating of the art and science of war. The only work perhaps in which an attempt has been made to treat of some branches of the military science such as the institution of spies, ambassadors, fortifications, the composition of an individual army, etc., is that *multum in parvo,* the *Kuṟaḷ* of Tiruvaḷḷuvar. The *Puṟapporuḷ Veṇbāmālai* of Aiyaṉāritaṉār of the Cēravaṁśā[2] is another important work but

[1] Tennyson, *Men of Letters Series,* p. 1.
[2] Edited by Paṇḍit V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

it is a much later work assigned generally to the seventh or the eighth century. But the works constituting the Śaṅgam Literature such as the *Tolkāppiyam*, the *Eṭṭut-togai*, the *Pattuppāṭṭu* and the *Padiṉeṇkīḻkkaṇakku* contain isolated passages and poems from which it is possible to form an idea of the methods of ancient warfare, the weapons then in general use, and the code of military ethics prevalent at that time. To these sources may be added the *mahākāvyas* such as the *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai* where there are stray references to the military exploits and martial valour of particular individuals, historical or fictitious, as well as descriptions of battles which the heroes fought and won, and these throw a considerable light on the question. These *mahākāvyās* are of varying dates from the second century to the ninth century A.D.

It is evident from our literary sources that ancient South India was inhabited by many tribes leading a nomadic and wandering life. But these various tribes belonging to the hill and forest regions appear to have been the off-shoots of the main tribe of the Nāgas who seem to have played a significant part in ancient Indian History. Most of these several tribes were full of martial spirit and showed prowess in battle. We may mention the names of a few like the Maṛavar[1] and the Eyiṉar.[2] The Maṛavar wore moustaches and beards and were brave and fierce-looking, being endowed with good physical strength. Their profession was highway robbery. Their weapons were simple, consisting of bows and arrows. They had a peculiar kind of drum that could be sounded on both sides. Highly struck by the display of their martial valour, the kings of the land

[1] *Kalit.*, st. xv, ll. 1-7.
[2] *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, ll. 130-80.

some of whom might be said to have belonged to the Vēḷir or the Vēḷāḷa tribes[1] freely enlisted them in their army ranks. It is said that able members of the Maṟavar tribes wielded the highest offices of the State. Some of them were Ministers and Commanders under the Cēra and Pāṇḍya kings as is seen from *Puṟanāṉūṟu*.[2] It is not difficult to infer, then, that these kings found in the members of these different tribes[3] valuable material for the upkeep and defence of their States and therefore utilized them to a large extent. It may be noted in passing that there was no rigid warrior-caste as such in ancient Tamil India.

Sec. II. THE OCCASIONS FOR WAR

The aims of war and the causes which precipitated the conflagration of hostilities were indeed many. To state them categorically, the first was the refusal to give maidens in marriage (*makaṇmaṟuttumoḻital*)[4] desired by the conquering monarch. This was the ground on which the three kings, the Pāṇḍya, Cēra and Cōḻa went to war with Pāri, the chieftain of Paṟambunāḍu who refused to give his daughter to any of the above monarchs.[5] In the same collection there is another mention of war on this account among the several neighbouring chiefs.[6] Secondly, lifting neighbours' cattle was one of the causes of

[1] M. Srīnivāsa Ayyangar distinguishes three types of Pre-Aryans in the Tamil country: (1) The Hill and forest tribes, (2) The Nāgas and (3) The Vēlir or the Vēḷāla tribes (see *Tamil Studies,* p. 61).

[2] St. 168 and 179.

[3] These tribes were later on classified by the Tamil grammarians and writers according to the locality—Neytal, Marudam, Mullai, Pālai and Kuṟiñji—which largely determined their occupation and the habitat. Each occupation being followed hereditarily became translated into a caste.

[4] மகண்மறுத்து மொழிதல்.

[5] *Puṟam,* 109-20.

[6] *Ibid.,* 336-54.

ancient warfare. This was the basis of many a war between several belligerent states in ancient India. This as well as the first mentioned find a prominent place in the *Puṟapporuḷ Veṇbāmālai.* A writer in the *Tamilian Antiquary*[1] concludes from this that 'this shows the beginnings of the Dravidian Society when people were semi-agriculturists and when there were no definite organized states.' But there are other elements pertaining to war which go to indicate an advanced state of civilization, social progress, and political development. Perhaps the same state of affairs is found mentioned in the pages of the *Mahābhārata.* Cattle-lifting is one among the several causes hastening the outbreak of war. The stealing of Virāṭa's cattle by Duryōdhana's soldiers offered an occasion for a contest with the latter. And from this we could not conclude that the *Mahābhārata* represents an epoch when the civilization of Hindu India was semi-agricultural in character. On the other hand, organized states and well-developed administrative institutions are found described elaborately. The error is probably due to the mistaken view of the writer that cattle-raids mentioned in the text are but ordinary cattle-liftings with which we are familiar even to-day and which are robberies, pure and simple. In ancient days, too, cattle-lifting was a robbery but a daring one and of such great magnitude that it was nothing short of a 'call to arms.'

Thirdly, ancient warfare had political objects as well. This was the extermination of recalcitrant rivals and refractory vassals. This was the ground on which Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ II, though young but possessing in full both physical and moral courage so essential to the success of a general, embarked on war

[1] *Tamilian Antiquary,* No. 5.

against his neighbours with a vow to defeat them in a pitched battle.[1] Yet another occasion for the war was the failure of vassal chieftains to pay tribute as in the case of the battle of Kalingam described in the *Kalingattupparani*, a treatise of the latter half of the eleventh century A.D.[2]

Sec. III. THE ARMY CORPS

As in ancient Greece the king led the hosts to war. He rode in a chariot with flying standards and under shelter of a white umbrella. Each king had his own badge, to distinguish him from others, worn on his pendant. The Cōḻa, Pāṇḍya and Cēra kings had respectively banners of fish, tiger and bow.[3] Again the king and also his generals wore garlands of flowers to distinguish themselves from the enemy ranks. That wreaths of flowers of margosa, palmyra and the *Ār* were worn by the Pāṇḍya, Cēra and Cōḻa monarchs respectively is testified to us by epigraphic evidence.[4]

In ancient times, the army, *paḍai, tāṉai* was divided into various groups.[5] Later on it came to consist of the traditional four-fold forces often met with in Sanskrit texts. These were chariots, elephants, horses and foot-soldiers. The *Kuṟaḷ* gives some salutary recommendations on the importance and value of an excellent army.

[1] *Puram*, st. 72.

[2] *Paraṇi* is a poem which narrates the heroic deeds of a warrior who had at least slain a thousand elephants on the field of battle. The extant work the *Kalingattupparani* is by one Jayaṅkoṇḍān in honour of Karuṇākara Toṇḍaimāṉ, possibly a general of Kulōttuṅga Cōḻa I (1069-1118).

[3] *Puram*, 367-77.

[4] *S. I. I.*, vol. ii, part i, No. 10.

[5] *Aṇi* [அணி], *uṇḍai* [உண்டை], *oṭṭu* [ஒட்டு] The front ranks were *ākkam* [ஆக்கம்], *koḍippaḍai* [கொடிப்படை], *tār* [தார்], *tūśi* [தூசி], *nirai* [நிரை], and back ranks, *kūḻai* [கூழை], *Pre-Āryan Tamil **Culture***, p. 39.

To a king a victorious army, strong in all its constituent parts and fearless in battle, is a very valuable asset. A small army of well-trained and well-practised veterans is better than a large army ill-disciplined and ill-led. What will a host of rats avail against the hiss of an infuriated serpent? Without high-souled boldness, a keen sense of honour, strict observance of the glorious traditions of war and unflinching loyalty, an army would be good for nothing. And the army again must be well versed in all the military movements and manoeuvres.[1] From these few lines it would appear that Tiruvaḷḷuvar was no admirer of superiority of numbers. He laid great stress on the practical training of both the leader and the led.

As to the composition of the army corps itself, it has been already remarked that there was no distinct military caste. Divergent elements constituted an army force. Originally men of several indigenous tribes were enlisted to the ranks, these possessing heroic valour. Later on in the tenth and eleventh centuries we find that soldiers were recruited from the Left hand and the Right hand castes of South India by the Cōḻas as is evident from the Tanjore inscriptions.[2] It is manifest that during the time of Rājarājadēva, the army organization seems to have progressed to such an extent that as many as thirty-three regiments are mentioned as belonging to that king. Even members of the Brahmana caste seem to have been recruited to the ranks. In the same inscription there is distinct mention of a Brahmana military officer.[3]

As to the four-fold arms of the ancient host, the chariots of war were drawn by two horses furnished with two wheels and capable of accommodating only two

[1] *Tirukkuṟaḷ*, ch. 77. [2] *S.I.I.*, vol. ii, part 5, Intro., p. 9.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

persons—the warrior and the charioteer. These war-chariots, it may be remembered, were a peculiar feature of the early Mycenean civilization that flourished between 1,600 and 1,200 B.C. Riding on elephants or chariots was a privilege given only to a few. Generals of standing or persons belonging to the class of nobility were alone allowed to enjoy this honour. The cavalry force was another important constituent in the Tamil army organization. The cavalry soldiers did not wield heavy arms like the foot-soldiers. They wore short bucklers. The infantry men consisted of the archers and ordinary footmen. The archers used a bow and a quiver of arrows. The ordinary footmen carried a spear or battle-axe on their right hand and shields of ox-hide on the left. Invariably the infantry soldiers wore big and heavy weapons. All of them including the monarch wore anklets, a defensive armour.[1] Most of these correspond exactly to the implements both offensive and defensive of the ancient Mycenean culture. This would bear the weight of inference that these simple arms of offence and defence were a characteristic feature of all ancient warfare in the then civilized world.

Sec. IV. DEFENCES

In dealing with the art of war, mention must be made of the tactics of war. Under this category the defences form an important item. It is well known that early South India was a land of forests and jungles. Herein abounded a large number of ferocious hunters and robbers who were not infrequently disturbers of peace to the civil population. Besides there were a number of petty chieftains, ruling over small territories, who were, by inclination and attitude and rarely by any call of necessity, engaged

[1] Kanakasabai, *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago*, pp. 130-31.

in war among themselves. It is however reasonable to suppose that there were enlightened kings whose thirst for honour and renown induced them to undertake conquest on an extensive scale and earn an undying name in the world. This is what the Sanskritists say: *gām jitva divam jayati.* The conquest of dominions is a short road to the attainment of the chief place in heaven,—Indrahood. The Cōḻa king Karikālaṉ and his successor Cēṭceṉṉinalaṅkiḷḷi ,(about A.D. 95) had no other object in extending their sway over vast kingdoms. This was not the ruling passion of the monarchs alone. It was also the vivifying principle sacred to every warrior who bowed to it in silence. The conception of *Vīrasvarga*[1] was so preponderating that if warrior kings met with their death naturally owing to old age, and not on the field of action, it was a peculiar custom to make the dying man lie on a bed of *kuśa* grass and have him cut with a sword, the *Purōhita* chanting special mantras. The idea was that it was equal to being slain on the theatre of war.[2]

When the martial spirit was so rife, it is no wonder that there were incessant wars among the neighbouring kings of the ancient Tamil land. To shelter the civil population from the cruel jaws of marauding hunters, robbers, and other enemies of the kingdom, practically every village and town of Drāviḍa was guarded by an impregnable fortress, surrounded by unscalable walls, deep moat, and extensive and thick forests without.[3] The fortifications of Uṟaiyūr, Āvūr in the Cōḻa territory, of Madura, Kāñci,[4] and Karuvūr seem to have been strongly built and well furnished. The battlements and

[1] *Aham* 61, comment on *Tolkap. Ahat. Sūtra,* 44.
[2] *Maṇimēkalai,* xxiii, 10-15; *Puṟam,* 93.
[3] *Puṟam,* 21.
[4] *Maduraikkāñci, Ind. Ant,* vol. 40, p. 227.

ramparts, were provided with mechanical contrivances by which stones, burning oil and molten metal were thrown on the besiegers attempting to scale the walls. There have been curious devices in the shape of monkeys, kingfisher, sow, vulture, serpent, horse and swan referred to both in the *Śilappadikāram*[1] and the *Jīvakacintāmaṇi*.[2] There were again in existence *Kiḍaṅgas* or war trenches one of the most ancient species of ramparts perhaps in use before the introduction of mural fortification. These are found in Coorg and Travancore and resemble some of the earthworks of ancient Britons, stretching for several miles through the thick of forests or encircling the hill tops. Some of these trenches are forty feet deep. Inscriptions, dated A.D. 781 and 977, refer to them.[3]

The siege was sometimes long and protracted, possibly to wear out the enemy. This not unnaturally led to the starvation of the soldiers and spreading of famine among the inmates of the fort as exemplified in the siege of Āvūr by the Cōlaṉ Nalaṅkiḷḷi against the rebel Neḍuṅkiḷḷi. There is again a reference to the defence of his fort by Vēṅgaimārbaṉ when it was besieged by Ukkirap-peru-vaḻudi, the king of Madura.[4] Two methods were used to get at the fortress. One was to fill up the ditch and scale the wall by means of a ladder.[5] The other was to make fierce elephants batter the ramparts and force their way into the capital.[6] These favourably compare with what the remarkable author of that celebrated treatise, the *Arthaśāstra*, has said.

In dealing with the defences, mention may be made of

[1] Book i, ll. 101-4.
[2] xv, ll. 207-17.
[3] *S. I. I. Annual Report*, 1916-17, p. 37.
[4] *Puṟam*, 21.
[5] *Tolkāp. Poruḷ*, 68.
[6] *Kuṟal*, ch 75; *Puṟam*, 3, 6, 13 and 14.

the institutions of ambassadors and spies. Ambassadors are found referred to in earlier works of Tamil literature like the *Tolkāppiyam*[1] and the *Śilappadikāram*. According to the latter Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ had a number of *dūtas*, the chief of whom were Sañjaya and Nīla. Under them there were about 1,000 messengers. This denotes a large class of messengers who were also sent to the states of the neighbouring enemy kings. We can easily realize the magnitude of the army establishment under this king from this big establishment of the *dūtas*.[2] It was a custom to send ambassadors before the preliminaries of war were settled.

The *Kuṛaḷ* has an interesting chapter on the qualifications and functions of an ambassador. It rules thus:[3] An ideal ambassador is one who is loved by and is loving towards all, who has come of an ancient noble family and who is possessed of such estimable qualities as loyal affection to the king, deep sagacity, and persuasive power of speech. He must also be versed in all the current legal and moral and political codes, and above all must possess a commanding personality. When delivering his sovereign's message he must state it clearly and briefly and with pleasant suavity of manners and expression, scrupulously avoiding harsh and offensive language. Unimpeachable in his character and conduct, he must be superior to all temptations. He must successfully conduct his mission according to the time and place, fearless even of personal consequences. The office of ambassador was so important that any insult offered to envoys did not go unpunished. It is said that the great Rājarājacōḻa (A.D. 985) who conquered

[1] *Porul*, 25. From this it seems that Brahmanas were generally sent as *dūtas*.

[2] Canto. xxvi, ll. 137-8; *Ibid.*, xxviii, 1. 109.

[3] *Kuṛaḷ*, ch. 69.

malainādu killed eighteen princes in retaliation for insult offered to his ambassador.[1]

The other important institution is that of spies. Spies of different status and in different disguises went about the enemy's camp and kingdom to gather information in regard to the movements of the king and his army and faithfully to report it to their headquarters.[2] When Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ prepared himself for war, he did not feel called upon to send any ambassador, for he said that the spies of his enemy wandering in his State were sure to take the information more quickly and more promptly than his own ambassador.[3] This only demonstrates the fact that the system of espionage was largely prevalent and was even a regular feature of ancient military administration. According to the *Kuṛaḷ* the two necessary eyes of a king are the spies and a knowledge of the *Dharmśāstras*.[4] He must not put implicit trust in his spies but must watch their movements by setting other spies over them. The safest course for a king is not to act upon the report of a single spy but to take action only on the concurrent report of three spies sent out on the same errand independently and unknown to each other. Thus, both the ambassador and the spies are responsible for 'information' in war which denotes, according to Clausewitz, the knowledge of the enemy and his country. A study of these institutions reminds one of the *Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra* wherein similar rulings and recommendations are given.

Sec. V. THE MARCH OF THE ARMY

An expedition was to be undertaken after getting a full knowledge of the enemy's strength by means of

[1] *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 22, p. 142.
[2] *Tolkāp. Poruḷ*, 58.
[3] *Silappadikāram*, canto xxv, ll. 173-6.
[4] *Kuṛaḷ*, ch. 59.

spies and ambassadors. A general ultimatum was given to the enemy-kings, saying that such of those as would not obey of their own accord would be submitted to the horrors of war.[1] Even after this if the enemy did not show signs of obedience, war was resolved upon. This resolution was undertaken after a careful consideration of the place and time.[2] From the *sūtra* (76) of the *Tolkāppiyam,* the general season for expeditions was *kūtirparuvam* roughly October to December, while the conquering monarch could set out on march during the *vēṉirparuvam* roughly March and April, if he felt sufficiently strong for it.[3]

On the eve of the march in order to infuse spirit and encouragement into the minds of the soldiers, the king used to feed them sumptuously. This is styled as *Peruṉ:cōṟṟunilai*[4] by the *Tolkāppiyam.*[5] The king usually set out on the march on an auspicious day fixed by the astrologer. Worship was offered in the local temples with prayers for victory. It is said that Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ offered worship to both Śiva and Viṣṇu when he left for North India. If, owing to unforeseen circumstances, the king could not start on his journey at the fixed time, it was a custom to place the sword and the umbrella on the state-elephant and keep them outside the city gate as *parasthānam.*[6] This is styled as *nāṭkōḷ* by the grammarian.[7] After this

1 *Silap.* (*Kāṭcikkādai*), canto xxv, ll. 183-94.

2 *Mudumoḻikkāñci,* iv. 2. கழிதறு கண்மை பேடியிற் றுவ்வாது.

3 Cf Manu, vii. 182.
கூதிர் வேனி லென்றிரு பாசறைக்
காதலி னொன்றிக் கண்ணிய மரபினும்

4 பெருஞ்சோற்று நிலை.

5 See *Poruḷ. Sūtra,* 63, and the commentary of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar thereon.

6 *Silappadikāram,* canto xxvi, ll 33-45.

7 நாட்கோள் *Tol. Poruḷ. Sūtra,* 68.

the king followed in procession with all his paraphernalia. The wearisomeness of the march was enlivened by dancing and musical performances by professionals. It is obvious to note that a number of dancing girls and musicians of the fair sex formed a part of the commissariat. It is said that as many as 400 such persons followed Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ. The chief items of the commissariat were cart-loads of food-stuffs and other articles of use with a large establishment in charge. As many as 20,000 carriages and a thousand men formed the commissariat of Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ's army. With such elaborate arrangements, then, the army used to set out on march, the route being previously reconnoitred by men sent for the purpose.[1]

Sec. VI. DIFFERENT STAGES OF EXPEDITION

The *Puṟattiṇaiyiyal* of the *Tolkāppiyam* refers to various kinds of war operations which are primarily divided into five—*veṭci, vañji, uḻiñai, tumbai,* and *vāhai,* corresponding respectively to the five *tuṟais* or conventions. As the different incidents referred to herein are elaborately explained in the *Veṇbāmālai,*[2] we proceed to examine that work.

In the *Puṟapporuḷ Veṇbāmālai* to which we have had occasion to refer, there are elaborate details with regard

[1]See *Veṇbāmālai, Veṭcippaṭalam,* st. 6.

[2] Though the *Veṇbāmālai* is generally taken to be a work of the seventh or eighth century A.D., yet much of the matter it contains is very old. According to the commentator of the *Tolkāppiyam,* Pērāśiriyar, the *Veṇbāmālai* is based on the original and more ancient work *Paṉṉirupaṭalam,* literally 'The twelve Chapters,' which is, according to tradition, a composition of the disciples of the sage Agastya. (See the the commentary on *Tol. Marapiyal, sūtra,* 94).

to the different stages of a military enterprise.[1] Here the author distinguishes eight kinds of operations. The following is a categorical list of these operations.

1. The *veṭci* flower, *Ixora coccinia,* commonly called 'Flame of the Forest', refers here to the cattle-raiders. The king who resolves to wage war with another, summons his soldiers to bedeck themselves with garlands of *veṭci* and go forth to capture and carry off the herds of cattle belonging to the enemy king. The raiders ride on horses, armed with bows and spears, having already sent some scouts to reconnoitre. The hill fort is stormed and the cattle are seized and driven toward their capital. The spoils are divided and a feast is held. The raid commences and ends with the *canteen.* One feature of the celebration was the dance called the *vaḷḷi dance.*

2. The *karandai* is a kind of *tulasī* or basil of which the rescuers make a wreath to be worn as their badge. The owners of the herds are summoned to hasten to the rescue. They pursue the raiders and engage them in a battle. But they return home unsuccessful.

3. The *vañji* wreath is the symbol of a regular invasion. The *vañji* is a common creeping plant found on mountain slopes. The insulted king gathers his forces of elephants and warriors with swords and resolves to attack the conquering monarch. The soldiers heroically fight, devastate the country and burn

[1] The book is divided into twelve main chapters, containing 361 quatrains each chapter treating of one *tiṇai* and thus follows in substance the *Panniru-paṭalam.* Of these twelve *tiṇais,* the first seven come under the category of *Puṟam,* the eighth, ninth and tenth, under the category of *Puṟappuṟam* and the last two under *Ahappuṟam.* This division of the matter and the plan of the book seem to confirm that the matter it treats of is old, at least as old as the Śaṅgam works. It is closely allied in subject and tone to the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and the *Tolkāppiyam* (see G. U. Pope, in the *Tamilian Antiquary,* 1910).

the city. The spoils are distributed and the vanquished chieftain offers submission and tribute. Houses of Brahmanas, temples and *śālās* of ascetics are not, however, molested, though they are of the foe.

4. The *Kāñci* is the *Ulmus intergrifolia* or elm tree with dark foliage. Garlands of its flowers were worn by the defenders of an invaded kingdom indicating their firm resolve to conquer or to die. The soldiers decked with *kāñci* flowers determine to make another last effort in their fortress. The battle is over. Men and animals fall dead. Heroic wives perish with their fallen heroes. A universal wail deafens the atmosphere. The heroes find an honoured place in heaven. The conquered people are completely crushed, no more to rise.

5. The defence of the fort went by the appellation of *noccittiṇai*. The *nocci* is the *Viten nirgundi*, a wild plant of leaves and flowers. The warriors in *nocci* garlands ascend their strongholds to shoot forth deadly arrows so as to defeat and drive back the besiegers.

6. The action of the besiegers attacking the enemy's fort is designated as *Uḻiñaittiṇai*. The *Uḻiñai* is the *Oerua lantar*, a variety of cotton plant. The besiegers cut down the neighbouring fortresses and make out of them rafts to cross the moat. The conqueror scales the walls with ladders and gets a forcible entrance into the fortress. The town is ploughed with asses, the walls are pulled down, and the whole territory is laid waste. The prowess of the conqueror is dreaded even by other monarchs who seek voluntary submission.

7. The *tumbaittiṇai* represents war in general. The *tumbai* is the *Phlornis Indica*, the *drōṇa* of Sanskrit. The conquering monarch feels the monotony of life and thirsts after war. He is aware of its horrors and seems to hesitate at first. But when once he feels

the necessity for it, he does not go back. He awards rich gifts to his soldiers so as to infuse fresh spirit into their minds. All the four arms of the army are pressed into service. The battle is fought and heroes meet with a glorious death.

8. The *Vāhai* (*Mimosa flectuosa*) is of white flowers symbolical of victory and peace. The conqueror wears the garland of *vāhai* and girds himself with a purple cincture. The victory is celebrated in different ways. The Brahmanas perform *yajñas*, the *vaiśyas* attend to agriculture and commerce. The Vēḷāḷas join in the chorus of victory by their faithful toil. The heroic mother celebrates it with all glee and joy. There is universal jubilation.

Sec. VII. THE CURIOSITIES OF WAR

A passing mention may now be made of other features and curiosities of warfare in ancient South India. The consultation of auguries,[1] the worship of the war-goddess *Koṛṛavai* with the sacrificial offerings, dance and song, and the distribution of food and drink and largesses to soldiers on the eve of the march, the drunken revels with which a victory is celebrated, widowed women unwilling to be separated from their dead husbands, proceeding to the field of encounter in search of their bodies and embracing them and giving up their lives then and there, or entering the funeral pyre along with their husband's wound-covered bodies,[2] appear to have been common practices.

To the above may be added the employment of the camel in fight as in that of Kaliṅgam and the capture of women as legitimate prizes in war. Contempt for

[1] *Puṛanāṉūṛu* mentions nine evil portents.

[2] *Puṛapporuḷ*, p. 34, st. 13 and p. 38, st. 22. *Kaḷavaḻi*, st. 29 (*Ind. Ant.*, vol. 18).

the defeated enemy was shown by attaching to the standard of victory a ball and doll which tended to signify perhaps his effeminate character.[1]

Among the other peculiarities of ancient warfare in South India may be mentioned the part played by the heroic mothers of Tamil Nāḍu. The weaker sex of the ancient fighting communities were none the less the better sex.[2] To them, the military achievements by their near and dear ones were something sacred and inviolable. They would rather be husbandless and sonless than allow their country to incur the odium of defeat and disgrace. They allowed their husbands and sons to sacrifice themselves, if need be, at the altar of the battlefield for the sake of God, crown and country. It is said that, when a mother heard of the death of her only son on the field of action, she ran to the field to see whether he died by getting a wound either at the back or at the breast, taking a vow that if he had fallen owing to a wound on the back she would cut off her breasts that gave milk to him.[3] For, it was deemed a disgrace to die in the field with wounds received on their backs. To quote one classic example, when the Cēra king Ātan II was wounded on the back at the battlefield of Veṇṇil by Karikālan̲, the king of the Cōlas, he sought a voluntary death.[4] From the following ode in the *Puram*

ஈன்று புறந்தருத லென்றலைக் கடனே
சான்றோ னாக்குத றந்தைக்குக் கடனே
வேல்வடித்துக் கொடுத்தல் கொல்லற்குக் கடனே
நன்னடை நல்கல் வேந்தற்குக் கடனே
யொளிறுவா ளருஞ்சம முருக்கிக்
களிறெறிந்து பெயர்தல் காளைக்குக் கடனே.

1 *Tirumuru*, ii, 67 and 68.
2 *Puram*, 278-9, also *Veṇbāmālai* verses 175-6.
3 Paṇḍit M. Rāghava Ayyangar's contribution in *Sen Tamiḻ*, vol. v.
4 *Puram*, 65 and 66.

we find that the poetess Ponmuḍiyār sent her son to the field of battle and was happy. This only shows how heroic the ancient men and women of South India were.

Some other features of ancient warfare may be mentioned. On the eve of military expeditions it was usual that the royal priest uttered words of encouragement to soldiers drawn in array. The chief officers of the state also tendered words of advice. The king set out at the auspicious hour fixed by the astrologer. This well-nigh corresponds to what Kauṭalya has recommended in his treatise. With the above-mentioned formalities Cēraṉ Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ, son of Ātaṉ II about A.D. 90 set out on an expedition to the Himalayas.[1]

In these expeditions it was a custom that bards accompanied the kings to the field encouraging the soldiers now and then and making them ever spirited. This class of minstrels was known as *Porunar*. They carried with them a small drum which, if sounded, was an indication for the army to commence its march.[2] In times of peace they sang the glories of ancient heroes. This idea is more or less in line with Kauṭalya's dictum that the Purōhita follows the king to the theatre of war and instils spirit into the soul of the army by his stirring words. However this may be, it is evident that the war-chants sung by these Tamil bards contributed much towards the successful termination of conflicts. There were two classes of poems, the *parani* and *ulā*. *Paraṇi* describes a campaign where a hero is said to have killed at least a thousand elephants. *Kaliṅgattup-paraṇi* is an example of this type. *Ulā* again is a poem giving a picture of royal procession accompanied by flags, musical instruments and other retinue. The poems

[1] *Silap.*, cantos xxv to xxx.
[2] *Puṟam*, 382.

of this class are those by Oṭṭakūttar on Vikramacōḻa, Kulōttuṅga II, and Rājarāja II of the twelfth century A.D. That the bards accompanied the king to the field of operations is sufficiently manifest from the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and *Takaḍūryāttirai*[1] wherein the names of the bards of the Cōḻa and Cēra kings are mentioned. Kaḻāttaḷaiyār was the bard of the Cēra king Ātaṉ I and Veṇṇik-kuyattiyār was the poetess of the Cōḻa king.[2]

Another curiosity of warfare was to fell the guardian tree (*kāvalmaram*) of the enemy and make out of the cut trunk a war drum. It would appear that each Tamil chief grew a special tree which was the symbol of his sovereignty. To fell that tree amounted to capturing the chieftain's flag. An instance of this is furnished when Imayavarambaṉ Neḍuñjēralātaṉ felled the *kaḍambu* tree in an island which he captured.[3]

These are not all. *Vīrakkals* or herostones planted on the grave-yards of soldiers fallen during the conflict have been found scattered in all parts of South India.[4] This *vīrakkal* is known in Tamil literature as *naḍukal*. There were six stages in the planting of this stone according to Tolkāppiyaṉār. These were to find out the appropriate stone, to fix an auspicious hour for carving out the image and inscribing, to get the stone bathed in sacred waters, to plant it in the place

[1] This is an ancient work celebrating the battle of Takaḍūr between Cēramāṉ Peruñcēral Irumporai and Adigamāṉ. The work is now lost but there are quotations from it in the commentary of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar on the *Tolkāppiyam*. In the commentary on the *sūtras* 63 and 67, Ariśil Kiḻār and Poṉmuḍiyār are said to have addressed the soldiers in the field.

[2] *Puṟam*, 65 and 66.

[3] See *History of the Tamils*, pp. 500-1; *Aham*, 347, ll. 3-5; also 127.

[4] *S. I. I. Annual Report*, 1912 and 13 (Anantapur and Cuddapah Dts.).
„ „ „ 1913 „ 14 (Nilgiris).
„ „ „ 1916 „ 17 (Coorg, etc.).

already fixed and to celebrate it as a deity.[1] An epitaph dated A.D. 936 runs as follows:—

'Prosperity! In the 9th year of King Parakēsari Varman who conquered Madura when cattle were lifted at Muttukūr by the Perumānadigal, Vedunavaran Varadan Tandan, having recovered them fell.'[2]

Marakkāñci[3] is one of the ten sub-divisions of *āṇpārkāñci*[4] of the *Kāñcitturai* referred to in the *Purattiṇaiyiyal* of the *Tolkāppiyam*. According to this, a wounded soldier with heroic impulses would not think of getting the wound cured thus to live again in this earth. As heroism would have it, he would further make the wound ulcerous and give up his life.

Sec. VIII. WAR MUSIC

In the description of the battle between Śeṅguṭṭuvan and the northern kings,—Kanaka and Vijaya,—there is mention of a number of musical instruments which were displayed on the occasion. Some[5] of them were *koḍumparai, neḍuvayir, muraśam, pāṇḍil, mayirkkaṇ-muraśam*. It is said that some of these instruments deafened the atmosphere and created an echo from all the different directions.[6]

Sec. IX. NAVAL WARFARE

In dealing with the art of war as practised in South India, it would not be out of place to refer

[1] காட்சி கால்கோல் நீர்ப்படை நடுகல்
சீர்த்த மரபிற் பெரும்படை வாழ்த்தல்.
Sūtra: See also *Sen Tamil*, vol. iii, p. 2; see also *Aham*, 67 and 131; *Puram*, 263 and 264.

[2] Quoted by M. Srinivasa Ayyangar, *Tamil Studies*, p. 40; cf. T. A. Gopinatha Rao's article in *Ceylon Ant.*, vol. i, p. 77 ff.

[3]

[5] கொடும்பறை, நெடுவயிர், முரசம், பாண்டில், மயிர்க்கண் முரசம்.

[6] *Silap, Kālkōṭ Kādai*, canto xxvi, ll. 193 ff.

to the maritime activities with which the ancient Tamils were greatly connected. There is every reason to believe that the ancient Tamils were a great sea-faring nation. Each of the great kings seems to have possessed and maintained a fleet of several ships. From many poems in the *Padirruppattu*, one or two passages in the *Ahanānūru* and some references in the *Silappadikāram*, it is evident that the ancient Cēra, Cōla and Pāṇḍya monarchs, through love of conquest and adventure, undertook and successfully conducted large maritime expeditions to far-off lands and islands.

According to the *Padirruppattu* (second *padikam*) Imayavaramban Neduñjēralātan possessed a naval army and led an expedition to a neighbouring island and felled the *Kadamba* tree, the guardian tree of that chieftain—a sure sign of victory.[1] It would appear that Cēran Śenguttuvan had a more organized naval force which showed its superiority in different naval fights.[2] These literary pieces of evidence are further confirmed by the more reliable source of information, viz., the inscriptions. Rājarājadēva, whose date of accession according to Professor Kielhorn is A.D. 985, is said to have destroyed the great fleet of the Cēras at the port Kāndaḷūr.[3] Again the same monarch is credited with having subjugated 12,000 islands besides Ceylon. The other great monarch who is connected with maritime expeditions is Rājēndracōla. He conquered the great and important sea-port Kadāram by fitting out a fleet of ships in the midst of the rolling sea.[4] Vīrarājēndra I, again extended his conquest farther than India—Kadāram,

[1] Cf. *Aham*, 127.

[2] *Padirru*, 45 and 46, 48; *Aham*, 212; *Silap.*, canto. xxvii, ll. 119-21; *Puram*, 126.

[3] *S. I. I.*, vol. ii, part 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, part 1, No. 20.

Nicobar Islands and Ports on the coasts of Burma.[1] These, added to the several expeditions mentioned in the Śaṅgam works, are enough to bear eloquent testimony to the fact that naval warfare was not unknown to ancient Tamilians.

Sec. X. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Besides commercial and political relations with North India centuries before the Christian era, there existed commercial relation between South India on the one hand and Babylonia, Arabia and Egypt on the other.[2] In the beginning of the Christian era we find a growing trade between South India and Greece and Rome and especially with the latter. This was in addition to commercial transactions with Persia, Africa and China. The export of parrots and peacocks was a speciality.[3]

Commercial relations always led to political adjustments and relations. Such continued and frequent intercourse not only with North India, but with other civilized countries beyond the Indian continent implies the necessity of the institution of a well-organized foreign office. Nearer home the ancient Tamil kings had to face serious responsibilities. The relations with North India and islands beyond the seas, such as Ceylon, became strained and stiffened in course of time, often resulting in huge wars. That South India had political relations ever since the age of the *Mahābhārata* war is evident from an ode in the *Puṟam* where reference is made to a king Cēralātaṉ undertaking the Big Feed of the belligerent forces in the Great War. Whether this

[1] *S. I. I.*, vol. iii (8), pp. 194-8.

[2] See *History of the Tamils,* ch. vii, p. 96 ff; also Warmington *Commerce between Roman Empire and India,* pp. 192-3; Schoff's *Periplus,* pp. 121-2, 171, *J.R.A.S.*, 1917, p. 237.

[3] See *History of the Tamils,* ch. xiv and ch. xviii.

is true or no, there are other evidences which demonstrate the expansion of the Empire under Karikārcōlan and the Cēra kings Imayavaramban and Śeṅguṭṭuvan in the early centuries after the Christian era.

Among the three early kings of South India, while the Pāṇḍyas could claim at best only a kingdom, the Cōlas and the Cēras could boast of an empire that extended as far as the distant Himalayas. It is difficult to believe that the extant accounts in the Śaṅgam literature regarding the invasions of North India by South Indian kings of these early centuries are legendary and consequently of no historical value. We propose to credit them with some veracity and utilize them for purposes of history.[1] The works of the Śaṅgam Age make pointed references to the invasions of North India. According to the *Śilappadikāram*, Karikālan turned his covetous eyes on the fertile plains of the Hindustan. He marched uninterrupted as far as the heart of the great Himalayan mountains where he planted his tiger seal in glorious token of his successful march. On the way the kings of North Indian states such as Vajra, Magadha and Avanti, who had heard of his prowess, sought voluntary submission by offering tributes. It is said that these three kings presented to Karikālan a Canopy, a Hall of Audience, and a Triumphal Arch respectively. Barring some exaggeration, one has to admit the fact of invasion and submission by payment of tributes by the Northern kings, whatever be the kind of tribute offered.[2]

The same story is told of Imayavaramban Neduñjēralātan, the Cēra king. The details of his invasion are lacking. All that is known is that he extended his

[1] See T. G. Arāvamuthan the *Kāvēri*, the *Maukharis* and the *Śaṅgam Age*, pp. 58-9.

[2] Canto v, ll. 90-98.

arms wide all over India and as far as the Himalayas. It is also said that he set his emblem which was the bow on the slopes of the lofty Himalayan range.[1]

We have more materials when we come to an examination of Śeṅguṭṭuvan's expedition against the North. Śeṅguṭṭuvan led two expeditions. The first expedition was the result of his ambition to get a block of Himalaya stone to make an image of his mother who sought death on her husband's funeral pyre.[2] The other expedition was undertaken to get another block of Himalayan stone to carve an image of the Pattini Dēvi, no other than Kaṇṇaki, the heroine of the *Śilappadikāram*. It is said that his march was interrupted by two princes Kanaka and Vijaya[3] among others. They were routed and taken prisoners.[4] It is said these prisoners of war were ordered to carry that stone all the way to Cēranāḍu.[5]

Sec. XI. ETHICS OF WARFARE

The present study would be incomplete if we do not refer to the ethics of warfare as then prevalent in South India. War is held to be a necessity in Tennyson's *Maud* as an effective cure for the evils of peace. This was more or less the notion prevalent among the ancient Tamils. Hence, it could not be said that their ethical standard rose to any higher level. Mr. M. Srinivasa Ayyangar remarks that the ancient Tamils were a ferocious race of hunters and soldiers like the ancient Assyrians and Babylonians making war for the pleasure of slaying, plundering and

[1] *Śilappadikāram*, canto. xxv, (*Kātci*) 1-3; see also *Aham*, 127, ll. 3-5; *Padirṟu.*, ii. *Padikam*.

[2] *Śilap*. canto xxv; Kātci, ll. 160-4, 28 (Naḍukal), ll. 119-21.

[3] *Ibid.*, xxvi, (Kālkoṭ), ll. 188-220.

[4] *Ibid.*, ll. 225-30.

[5] For further details of these invasions, see *Kāvēri*, *Maukhari* and the *Saṅgam Age*, p. 27 ff.

devastating. In support of this statement he quotes chapter and verse from that great classic work *Śilappadikāram*.[1] Possessed of such characteristics, it could not but be that most of their wars were aggressive in character. It was the rule among the so-called Aryan kings to take to war only as the last resort. Ways and means were taken to stay the war and avoid it as far as possible, for they were conscious of its cruelties, horrors and dangers. The means used were chiefly three in number—*sāma* or conciliation, *dāna* or gifts and *bhēda* or dissension. These were tried one after the other and when all of them failed, only then, open battle was declared and entered upon. This seems not to have been in large practice in South India. Even the Cōḻa kings at a much later period (tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.) entered into aggressive warfare. Still evidences are not wanting to go to prove that in the golden age of the Tamils, some means or other was used to avert a regular war. Thanks to the bards who were free lances and evoked respect even from the enemy kings, many a battle was indeed averted. They acted as mediators and arbitrators and brought about a reconciliation by negotiating with both the belligerent states. To mention one or two instances, Kōvūr Kiḻār struck up a compromise between the two Cōḻa princes, Neḍuṅkiḷḷi and Nalaṅkiḷḷi, and thus avoided a war which would otherwise have proved an evil to the land.[2] That Kōvūr Kiḻār was a successful mediator, is obvious from another similar and even more tragic case. When Kiḷḷi-Vaḷavaṉ seized the little sons of his hostile vassal Malayamāṉ, he ordered their heads to be crushed by an elephant. It was Kōvūr Kiḻār who saved the situation by his timely intervention on behalf of the little ones.[3] He easily

[1] *Tamil Studies*, p. 41. [2] *Puṟam*, 47. [3] *Ibid.*, 46; see also 45.

effected their release. Again it was Poygaiyār who by his immortal work *Kaḷavaḻi forty* effected the release of the imprisoned Cēra King Kaṇaikkāl Irumpoṟai.[1] Such tactful intercession on behalf of weak adversaries sometimes failed also. For example, Ālattūr Kiḻār interceded on behalf of the people of Karuvūr, Cēra's capital, when the latter was besieged by the Cōḻa king, but with no success.[2]

Not only were their wars aggressive but also their treatment of the vanquished was far from humane. Often the capital city was entered, burnt down or rased to the ground and plundered of all wealth and treasure. From the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* it is seen that after raising the standard of victory, the ruin of the capital was effected by ploughing the roads and streets with donkeys and sowing seeds of castor, cotton and other cereals.[3] According to another stanza even the houses of Gods were not spared.[4] Surely the object seems to have been to convert the city into a jungle. This does not bespeak a high code of morality in practice. But, it would be an error to suppose that it was the only state of affairs, for there are a few cases of reinstating the defeated monarch on terms of subordinate alliance or as tributary vassal. This was largely the practice of the later Cōḻa sovereigns. A classical example is that of Kaṉakaṉ and Vijayaṉ, princes of North India, who were defeated by Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ and taken as prisoners. But on their submission, they were set free and sent back to their capitals, with all the paraphernalia due to a tributary chieftain.[5]

With such ideas of war one could not expect righteous warfare in practice. In fact there was no war based

[1] *Kaliṅgattu.*, st. 182. [2] *Ibid.*, 36. [3] *Ibid.*, 15.
[4] *Ibid.*, 392. [5] *Śilap.*, canto xxviii, ll. 195-202.

on the cult of Dharma as Hindu law-givers understood it. But it could not be asserted that the ancient Tamils were devoid of either a code of chivalry or a code of ethics. There were indeed some humane laws of war. Non-combatants, such as Brahmanas versed in Vēdic lore, women, the diseased, the aged, the sonless, and the sacred animals to boot, were previously warned to find secure homes inside the fortress lest they should be killed in the contest.[1] The *Śilappadikāram* mentions the horrors of the war of Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ with the Northern kings, striking terror into the minds of the soldiers and others present. The latter cast off their arms and escaped in the guise of ascetics, *Jaina* monks, musicians and dancers, for these were not usually done injury to, as they came under the category of non-combatants. It is said that when the battle came to an end, the king ordered that the Brahmanas versed in Vēdic lore and engaged in *agnihōtra* performances must be accorded due regard and should be protected at all costs.[2]

There is another ruling which says that the indolent, the sonless, the retreating, the hermaphrodite, the weaponless, he who flies with dishevelled hairs, one who does not use equal weapons and such others are not to be slain in battle.[3] These are some of the rules to be observed in righteous warfare (Dharma-Yuddha) according to the Sanskritists. It would appear that the introduction of such healthy laws of war must have been when the people had passed the tribal stage and finally settled themselves in organized states. It may be again due to the influence of Aryan culture when, as it is believed,

[1] *Puṟam,* 9.

[2] *Silap*, canto xxvi (Kālkoṭ-kādai), ll. 248-9.

[3] Naccinārkkiniyar on the *Tolkāppiyam, Poruḷ, Sūtram* 65; see also *Siṟupañcamūlam,* st. 41.

the Aryans migrated to South India and settled in large numbers.

Further, slaying of men in great numbers in the field was not considered a great distinction though it was indulged in largely. But it was reckoned a real feat of skill or valour if a warrior could slay even a single elephant. This only demonstrates the fact that the elephants were deemed so valuable and useful a commodity in warfare that to disable, if not to kill one was to win the crown of wild olive.[1] Lastly, that the kings loved their soldiers and were solicitous towards the wounded and the disabled is sufficiently manifest. Nakkīrar describes in felicitous terms how Neḍuñjeḻiyan II behaved towards the wounded in his camp. At midnight, despite inclement weather, chill wind and drizzling rain, the king used to leave his camp followed by a few attendants holding lighted torches to visit and make kind and sympathetic enquiries after each soldier suffering from pain. Usually a General would go in advance pointing out to the king the heroic men wounded in the previous day's fight.[2] From these and other similar references it would be logical to deduce the conclusion that the Tamilian code of ethics was not immoral but a-moral.

Sec. XII. THE BATTLE OF KALIṄGAM

To understand aright the mobilization of an army, the line of battle, encampment, the actual contest, the various weapons used, the modes and methods of fighting, the descriptions of the field after battle, the consequences of the end of battle on both the victorious and the vanquished, the battle of Kaliṅgam is here described.

[1] *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago*, p. 131.
[2] *Neḍunal-Vāḍai* (*Pattuppāṭṭu*, vii), ll. 169-88.

Though the actual battle took place in the eleventh century A.D., yet the method described follows the traditional system and is therefore of value to us.

Anantapadmaṉ, the king of the Kaliṅgas, had failed to pay customary tribute for two years to the Cōḻa king Vijayataraṉ, better known as Kulōttuṅga I, who thereupon ordered a war to bring the recalcitrant king to his knees. Karuṇākaraṉ, a really great general, volunteers to lead the army and is given the command. The armies are mobilized. With drums beating, conches and bugles blowing, pendants flying and banners floating so as to deafen and darken all round, the four-fold forces gather and get ready; the elephants are like so many mountains, the horses like so many storm winds, the chariots like so many clouds, and the soldiers like so many fierce tigers. Then they march on in martial array with Karuṇākaraṉ mounted on his mighty war-elephant at their head.[1]

Marching past the intervening parts they reach the frontier of the Kaliṅga country and signalize their arrival by burning, sacking, and pillaging the outlying cities and villages with fire and sword. Frightened at this dreadful havoc, the people run with breathless haste and bewildering confusion to the capital and report to their king the hostile approach of a mighty force evidently despatched against them by the Cōḻa king. On hearing this, the proud Kaliṅga chieftain laughs a derisive laugh and speaks in disparaging terms of the power and the strength of the foe, and orders forth his armies to take the field instantly against the enemy. A mighty army soon musters from various parts, and the chariots, the cavalry, and the infantry move in serried ranks, the chariots rolling thunderously along, the horses clanking swiftly past and the soldiers marching briskly forward.

[1] *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi,* st. 331-50.

The two armies are now face to face and at a given signal the Kaliṅga forces begin to charge, the air being filled with the twang of the innumerable bows and warlike shouts of the soldiers. The Kaliṅga forces advance and encounter the enemy. A deadly fight ensues, steeds fighting with steeds, elephants encountering elephants, chariots dashing against chariots, foot-soldiers attacking foot-soldiers and princes opposing princes. The archers then discharge a regular shower of arrows with such a deadly effect that blood flows in rivers across the field with the mangled and mutilated remains of the fallen elephants and soldiers floating on them.[1]

The collision of the tusks of the opposing elephants produces sparks of fire from which immediately the flags take fire and the whole field is enveloped in clouds of smoke. With their tusks intertwined, they push them home into each other's forehead. Before the on-rushing elephants, the bold warriors expose their dauntless breasts and with their weapons fell down their tusks.

Against the archers ready to discharge their arrows the cavalry rush impetuously, but the fatal darts bring the horse and warrior down. From the death-dealing darts and other missiles of the Cōḻa soldiers, the Kaliṅgas shelter themselves with their shields, closely forming a solid bulwark, but with little avail. The spears and javelins pierce through the shields and effect wide openings. Here some warriors with the arrows in their quivers exhausted, pull out the arrows sticking in their body and discharge them. Others with no weapons on hand instantly snatch off the lances sticking out of the foreheads of elephants lying dead close at hand and hurl them. When the battle was at its hottest, the general Karuṇākaraṉ rushes to the front on his

[1]*Ibid.*, 350-406.

war-elephant and his presence inspires fresh spirit and courage in his troops who thereupon fight with redoubled vigour and fury. Elephants and horses immeasurably fall dead and the whole field is thickly bestrewn with their mutilated limbs and mangled bodies together with the shattered wrecks of chariots and splintered spears, the broken arrows and the trunks of several warriors. Swarms of crows and kites flock about to feast upon the dead bodies. And the proud Kaliṅga army with their thousand elephants in rout and confusion fly from the field dashing to the ground their high hopes and vain vaunts of their sovereign. To escape pursuit and capture, some of the fugitives take refuge and hide themselves in mountain caves, subterranean caverns or dense jungles.[1] Some plunge into the sea and swim off and some screen themselves in the dismembered bodies of dead elephants. All the men having thus fallen or fled, an immense booty consisting of many elephants, horses, camels, chariots and treasure chests, with a large number of maidens falls into the hands of the victors. Having secured all this valuable booty the Cōḻa general desires to take the Kaliṅga chieftain prisoner and to carry him in triumph to his sovereign. He sends emissaries in all directions to search his whereabouts, to make a very close search in every nook and corner and they return to report that they could find no trace of the king, but that they found an army of his, lying on the top of a high hill. The general orders a strong detachment to proceed to the spot in question and surround and subdue the army entrenched therein. The place is stormed and taken and all are put to the sword except a few who, disguising

[1] *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi,* 405-26.

themselves as Jains, or Buddhists, or Brahmana pilgrims, or wandering minstrels sue for mercy and escape with their lives. Having thus laid waste the whole of the sea-coast kingdom of Kaliṅga, and planting there a pillar of victory, Karuṇākara Toṇḍaimāṉ, lord of the Vaṇḍaiyar returns and lays at the feet of his master all the spoils of war.[1]

[1] For other details see M. Raghava Ayyangar's *Kaliṅgattupparaṇi ārāyicci*, 40-44.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL LIFE IN TAMIL LAND

Sec. I. TOWNS AND TOWN LIFE

AN attempt is made here to study the town and city life of the Tamil people from the earliest times. This picture of the people is drawn from a study of the literature of the period. Contemporary literature and tradition as transmitted in lierary records supply us with materials with which we have to construct our history. For Tamil literature, like her sister literature the Sanskrit, does not contain any books devoted to the subject of history proper. The ancients perhaps realized that the life of the people as portrayed in literature would be better and far more interesting than the mere dry bones of history with arithmetical chronology. Accordingly they have bequeathed to us a rich legacy of literature of which any civilized nation may feel legitimately proud.

Vañjik-Karuvūr, the Cēra Capital.—The location of this ancient city of Vañji or Karuvūr has been the subject of much controversy which has now been set at rest, we hope, by the identification of it with the present Karūr in Trichinopoly district.[1] We do not intend to go into the merits of the question as we are here concerned only with town life. The Śaṅgam works generally mention this town frequently and this points to its importance.[2] Every town of importance had a strong fortification round it. So also Karuvūr had

[1] See M. Raghava Ayyangar, *Cēraṉ Śeṅguṭṭuvaṉ* and R. Raghava Ayyangar *Vañjimānagar* (1917), pp. 161-87, see *S.I.E. An. Rep.* 1928, p. 50.

[2] *Puṛam,* 11 and 387; *Siṛupāṇ,* 50; *Silap.,* canto xxvi, line 50, *Padiṛṛu,* 60 especially the gloss.

a strong fortress. Outside the fortress were the temples, *śālas, maṭhas,* where lived ascetics and penance-performers. Between the fort-walls and these, there was a deep moat. The intervening space between the moat and the walls of the fortress was a defence-forest *Kāvaṛkāḍu.*[1] The walls of the fortress were fully equipped with armed men, and war implements. The gateway had a lofty *gōpuram* defended by guards. This gate led on to a number of streets where fish, salt, liquor, sweetmeats, meat, etc., were offered for sale. Next to these streets were others which were places of residence to the potters, copper-smiths, bronzesmiths, goldsmiths, carpenters, tailors, makers of garlands, astrologers, *pāṇar* or bards, vendors of gems and pearls. Beyond these, there were streets of Brahmanas, the *rāja-mārga* and the streets of royal officers. In the heart of the fortress-city there was the royal palace which contained the durbar hall, the council chamber, and the dancing hall. The same description of fortress, containing broad and busy streets, is found in regard to the cities of Madura and Kāñci.[2] We are told that the palace was lighted with lamps held by statues of metal made by the *Yavanas,* under the supervision of night watchmen who attended to the oiling of the lamps.[3] We do not know whether this arrangement of lighting was also extended to the streets of the city. Mention is also made of temples of guardian deities, in whose honour festivals were often held so that the city might not be visited by calamities providential or otherwise. There were besides hotels where food and sweetmeats were offered for sale.[4] What is more remarkable is the mention of a museum in the city.[5]

1 காவற்காடு.
2 See *Maduraikkāñci,* ll. 351 ff.
3 *Neḍunal,* ll. 101-4, cf. Perumpāṇ 316-7.
4 *Maduraikkāñci,* ll. 624-7. 5 *Ibid.* l. 677.

Puhār, an ancient city.—Among the ancient cities of Tamil land the most famous was Puhār, the capital of the Cōḻa monarchs. The vestiges of the ancient town cannot be even traced to-day. Puhār was the other name for Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam. Puhār simply means any city or town at the mouth of the river. From referring in general to any sea-port town situated at the mouth of a river, it came to be later identified specially, with Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam so much so that Puhār did not mean any other city than Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam.[1] This famous town must have been on the spot where the holy river Kāviri now falls into the sea. This was therefore at some distance from the present town of Mayavaram. Either the city has been devoured by the unceasing waves of the furious sea or has fallen into irrecoverable ruin through continued neglect and carelessness. Whatever the cause of its decay, it is obvious that once it was a highly flourishing centre, a great commercial place, a rich town, the capital of the Cōḻa monarchs for several hundreds of years.

Iḷaṅkō-Aḍigaḷ, the author of the celebrated Śaṅgam classic *Śilappadikāram,* speaks of this Puhār or Pūmpuhār as containing very ancient families.[2] If to the author of the second century A.D. the people settled in Puhār were of very ancient families, we can easily imagine how old and flourishing a city must Puhār have been. The city was unique in every respect. The people living there belonged to different communities

[1] Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam became such a famous city that the term 'paṭṭiṉam' in the Śaṅgam literature or later days meant only Kāviripaṭṭiṉam. In illustration we can quote the treatise entitled the *Paṭṭiṉappālai* dealing with this ancient city. Again the name of the author of the poems found in the eleventh *Tirumuṟai,* goes after the name of this old town, Paṭṭiṉattuppillaiyār (about the tenth century A.D). It reminds us of the fact that to-day paṭṭaṇam means only Madras city. In the same way in those days paṭṭiṉam meant the famous Puhār.

[2] பழங்குடி *Sen Tamil,* vol. iv.

and yet there was no unhealthy spirit of jealousy and hatred among them.

Merchant communities in the city.—Though we have reason to believe that members of different communities had their abodes in that ancient city, still the most influential community in the city seems to have been the merchants. Commerce by land and commerce by sea were their profession. These merchants had such a prosperous and flourishing trade that they amassed mountains of wealth. Puhār became one of the wealthiest towns of South India. This only shows that the ancient Tamils were forward in commerce. We know that trade and commerce are an index to a country's prosperity. With such an active enterprise, these commercial classes would have been very rich and consequently influential.

Flourishing international trade.—Puhār was then a city overflowing with milk and honey. The wealth of the merchant classes surpassed the wealth of the ruling chieftain. In that city in any season of the year, there would be found a host of foreigners—probably those who had commercial intercourse with South India, always coming and going and transacting business in the public market of the city. The market of the city was of huge dimensions. There any article which one desired could be got without fail. The articles were not only indigenous but also foreign. It is said that foreign merchandise of all sorts flooded the market streets of Puhār and the little Puhār put on the appearance of an island wherein the whole world encircled by the sea came to stay. It seems no exaggeration to remark that every country of the then known world had something or other to do with the capital of the ancient Cōḻa kingdom. This is testified to by other valuable sources of evidence. The find of Roman coins, and

other coins of equal value, and the records of the foreign travellers and visitors bear testimony to the active commercial relations between South India and the then known civilized world. With markets flooded with articles of different kinds and varieties catering for the needs and tastes of different classes of people, and with heaps of wealth, and with the protection afforded by the king of the land, Puhār was an ideal place for fashionable and rich men to spend a part of the year in.

Progress in the arts.—One sure test of a nation's culture and greatness is the degree of its advance in architecture and allied arts. That Puhār contained some lofty and magnificent buildings is evident from the phrase *Neḍunilaimāḍam.*[1] This expression connotes the idea that the building in question was several storeys high, and the floor referred to in the text must therefore be the central one.[2] Seven-storeyed buildings seem to have been common and were a familiar feature of ancient Tamil cities like Kāvirippūmpaṭṭiṉam. The erection of such huge and lofty buildings would not be possible without a corresponding development in the technique of architectural engineering. So we may take it that high engineering skill was developed in those days, and magnificent buildings were the result. But the windows of these buildings were different from those to which we are now accustomed.[3] They were

[1] நெடுநிலைமாடம் canto ii, l. 13, canto xiii, l. 69.

[2] The six floors, leaving the ground floor for the establishment, suggest that they were intended for use in the respective seasons of the year. The whole year was divided into six seasons (ṛitus) of two months each—spring, summer, winter, autumn, etc., and each floor was suitable for one particular season. Apparently, the top-floor was used in summer and the floor next below in spring and so on. These people who enjoyed such lovely things are compared to the happy dwellers in the country of the Uttarakurus, the ideal land of bliss and enjoyment for those who had won it through the practice of high virtue and penance.

[3] *Ibid.*, ll. 23-4; *Maṇi.*, iv, l. 53.

what can be called lattice windows with holes in the shape of the eyes of a deer.[1] These windows so-called were beautifully ornamented and richly decorated.

Appropriate to the lovely and well-ventilated buildings, happy enjoyment and overflowing riches, there was a superb supply of attractive furniture with choice decorations born of a highly developed knowledge in fine arts. Well furnished cots and beds were a permanent feature of the house. It is said that the stands of the cot were inlaid with lustrous gems of rare value in very well-to-do families and appeared in workmanship and finish like that done by Mayaṉ, the carpenter of the Gods. Making indeed due allowance for poetic descriptions and play of imagination, we cannot escape the conclusion that Puhār was once a famous and rich city with well-laid streets and highly attractive buildings. Trade and commerce prospered. The people were rich and above want. Life was enjoyable. The king extended his hand of protection, and assured peace and security to all his subjects.

The status of women.—It would thus appear that wealthy people inhabited the cities and their life was one of luxury and ease. Social life was very much enlivened by women participating freely in the amenities of life. They attended temples and tanks and took part in the public dances. They were allowed considerable freedom in the choice of their partners of life. They decked themselves with costly attire and ornaments and made themselves attractive. The dress of course varied according to their position in society. In the age of the *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai*, the Tamils knew the manufacture of cloths of fine texture with borders of different colours.[2] The yarn was so fine that the

[1] See also *Paṭṭiṉappālai*, 157. [2] ll. 82-3, cf. *Siṟupāṇ*, l. 236.

texture looked like the skin of the serpent and thin like the smoke.[1] Clothes were largely of cotton. Weaving in wool stood next, and last came clothes of silk.[2] Both woollen and silk cloths did not advance beyond the crude stage as they were not in wide demand. According to the commentator of the *Śilappadikāram*, cloth was also made of rat's hair.[3] It would appear that a good deal of spinning was done by women.[4] The aesthetic sense was so much developed that in addition to fine dress, they decorated their persons with jewels of pearl and gold. Decoration again consisted in painting the body with scented paste and powders and in wearing garlands of flowers. 'Women wore a cap of pearls for the *mammae* which were tied by means of a belt, *mulaikkaccu*.'[5]

Prostitutes.—There were special streets for courtesans and public woman. It would appear that fashionable young men resorted to their residences and spent their time there caring little for their wedded wives. It led in some cases to the utter ruin of one's own fortune, as in the case of Kōvalaṉ. Hence the chaste ladies of the town took care to guard their husbands from falling under the seductions of harlots. There is an ode in the *Naṟṟiṇai* (320), where a woman gives expression to this idea and shows how she had failed in her attempt to save her husband. In this ode it is said that harlots with leaf garment passed through the streets so as to attract young men of the place, thus striking terror into the minds of the housewives.

Ideal of feminine beauty.—People with such high aesthetic sense had a lofty ideal of feminine beauty. The following is one of the numerous descriptions of

[1] *Puṟam*, 397-8. [2] *Porunar*, 11, 154-5.
[3] Canto xiv, ll. 205-7. [4] *Puṟam*, 125.
[5] *Neḍunalvāḍai*, 136. See also *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture*, pp. 46-52.

feminine charms in the *Porunarārruppadai*[1]: 'The songstress had hair like the black sand on the sea-shore; her fair forehead was like the crescent moon; her eyebrow bent like the bow that kills; the outer end of her cool eyes was beautiful, her sweetly speaking mouth was red like the sheath of the fruit of the silk cotton tree; her spotlessly white teeth were like rows of many pearls; her ears were like the curved handles of scissors, and their lobes were shaking with bright ear-rings shaped like the crocodile. Her neck was bent down with modesty; her shoulders were like the waving bamboo trees; her forearms were covered with thin hair; her fingers were like the November flower which grows on the tops of high hills; her breasts, covered with light coloured beauty spots, were such as people thought it would cause her pain to bear them, and were so high that the rib of a cocoanut leaf could not go between them; her navel was very beautiful and resembled a whirlpool in water. Her waist was so small that observers could not guess that it existed (and that it bore the weight of the body) with difficulty. Her pudendum was adorned with a *megalai,* many-stringed waist-band with many bells, looking as if it swarmed with bees; her thighs straight and thin like the trunk of a female elephant; her lower legs were covered with hair, as they ought to be, up to the ankles and her small feet were like the tongue of a tired dog."[2]

Sec. II. THE VILLAGE LIFE

Means of transport.—Ancient South India was not primarily a country of towns. There were a number of villages most of them self-contained and self-sufficient. Each village was a local unit by itself, as warranted by the then conditions. Intercourse between village and

[1] ll. 25-47. [2] From *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture,* p. 77.

village, between village and town was not frequent. There were certainly roads which were confined mainly to towns. In the villages there were no metalled roads for vehicles to move easily on. The means of transport were mainly carts on the land and boats on the water.[1] We have a reference to carts loaded with salt in the *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*.[2] With such means of transport, there was not sufficient opportunity for the movements of a mass of people from one place to another. The little intercourse they had was for purposes of trade and commerce.

The Brahmanas.—In a village, then, as we have to-day, there was an *agrahāram* or the street where Brahmanas resided, and other streets where agriculturists and members of cottage industries lived. Beyond the villages, in the hills and forests lived in huts, hunters and similar classes. *Aharam* is the name given to the houses of Brahmanas. We have a description of a Brahmana's house in the *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* from which it is seen that the Brahmana was engaged in Vēdic rites and for this purpose reared in his own house the gentle cow. It would appear that this animal was released from the *pandal* for grazing in the village common, while the calf was kept at home.[3] There is again the evidence of the *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai* wherein the position and duties expected of the Brahmanas are exactly parallel to the prescriptions of the *Dharmasūtras*. That these Brahmanas engaged themselves in performing *yajñas*, and that some of them took to the life of a recluse is also evident.[4]

In the *Tirumurugāṟṟuppaḍai* we meet with a curious prescription in regard to the period of study. It

[1] *Maduraikkāñci*, ll. 75-83; *Puṟam*, 13. *Siṟupāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, ll. 252-3.
[2] ll. 60-65.
[3] *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, l. 297.
[4] *Tirumuru.*, ll. 126-35.

is said that one must be forty-eight years old before he entered the householder's life. It would be interesting to know whether there is any similar injunction in the *Dharmaśāstras*. To my knowledge there is no such reference.[1]

Agriculturists.—Agriculture has always been the main occupation of the people of India and much more so of the people of South India. Much dignity was attached to that profession and people took to it with all seriousness, for on it depended as even now, the food supply of the people. After the seasonal harvests were over, it was a custom among these agriculturists to take to amusements of different kinds. The amusements consisted mainly in eating and drinking, in singing and dancing. The food was not strictly vegetarian. From the *Porunarāṟṟup-paḍai*,[2] it is evident milk and milk products and roasted meat were in large use. Rice grains cooked, and sweet cakes of different varieties were a part of the staple food.[3] Fruits like the jackfruit and mangoes were also taken.[4] According to the *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*,[5] preserved mangoes were used as pickles. Liquor was indulged in by almost all classes of people. It was of different kinds. Rice liquor, liquor brewed from honey, and palmyra liquor were all in lavish and popular use.[6] This fact presupposes the existence of wine shops.[7] What is however curious is that these ancients did not make use of cocoanut liquor. At least we have not come across any such reference.

Their amusements.—Singing and dancing were

[1] Cf. ll. 179-80. For another account of the Brahmanas, see *Maduraik-kāñci*, ll. 468-73.

[2] ll. 103-7, 115-6. [3] *Ibid.*, 107-8 and 112-4.

[4] *Maduraikkāñci*, ll. 526-35. [5] ll. 308-10.

[6] *Malaipaḍukaḍām*, ll. 170-85; *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, l. 142; *Paṭṭinap-pālai*, l. 89 ff.

[7] *Paṭṭina.*; l. 180.

other favourite modes of amusement. Every village had a common dancing hall called *āḍu kaḷam*[1] or *āḍaraṅgu.*[2] It was also the village theatre. From the term *kaḷam*[3] it can be inferred that the set place must have been an open *maidan* enclosed for the purpose.[4] The same ode further demonstrates the fact that there was a class of professional actors and actresses. When public performances were held in these *kaḷams,* women attended and took part in the *tuṇaṅgai,*[5] a kind of dance. This is another instance of the freedom enjoyed by even village women in those days.

Houses, etc., in the village.—The houses of rich men of the village, like those in towns, were known as *māḍam,* implying thereby that they possessed an upper storey as well. Originally the houses were of timber and gradually stone came into use. Many-eyed lattice windows were a characteristic feature of these houses. The residences of the poorer people were huts with mud walls and thatched roofs.[6] There is a description of a hut of an Eyiṉar in the *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai* which throws some light on this topic. The *ūha* grass was the material used for thatching the roof. A strong beam served for fastening the door. In the front of the hut there was a *pandal* thrown over thick props of wood in addition to a few stakes planted here and there. Around the hut was an extensive compound encircled by a thick-set hedge of thorns.[7] There were also dogs. Oil-lamps were in use, made of stone or earthenware and were burnt with a cotton wick[8]. The lamp was lighted with fire made by churning wood.[9]

1 ஆடுகளம். 2 ஆடரங்கு.
3 *Maṇi,* canto iv, 6. 4 See *Kuṟuntogai,* 31.
5 துணங்கை. See *Silap.,* v, 1. 70.
6 *Padiṟṟu.,* 15, 13; *Paṭṭiṉappālai,* ll. 143-5. 7 ll. 117-129.
8 *Kuṟuntogai,* 353.
9 ஞெலிகோல்—தீக்கடைகோல். *Perumpāṇ* 1. 177-99.

Fire for other purposes was also got by a similar operation as for instance, making holes in the flute. This reminds us of the custom of making fire by churning one piece of wood on another for sacrificial purposes even to-day by Brahmanas performing Vēdic rites.

The Tamils: lovers of Nature.—Around the village in all parts were spread, as far as eye could see, extensive corn-fields and gardens containing fruits and flowers. In fact the ancient Tamilian was an ardent lover of nature. His observation of the Fauna and Flora was close and keen as is exhibited in ancient Tamil poetry.

Their appreciation of natural scenery was such that flowers marked their ways of life, whether they pertained to the household or war. Different flowers and shrubs such as *veṭci, nocci, kāñci,* were symbolic of the different incidents of war. Garlands of flowers were a decoration both with men and women, the wearing of which was an indispensable feature of their social life. It need not be said that these fruits and roots afforded rich food to the ancient inhabitants of the Tamil land. Even the leaves of trees woven together were used as garments. The ancient Tamils of the prehistoric period, it would appear, began with leaf garments and the practice continued even in the Śaṅgam epoch as is evidenced by frequent references to them in the Śaṅgam literature. In the *sūtra* of the *Tolkāppiyam* (*meyppāṭṭiyal*), there is a reference to this. It was a custom for the lover to present a leaf garment to his lady-love before the actual marriage.[1]

Sec. III. MARRIAGE AND MARRIAGE CUSTOMS

The whole of ancient Tamil literature can be roughly classified under two main heads: *Aham* and *Puṛam. Aham* is love, the unparalleled joy and experience of a

1 தழைவிி கையுறை யேற்றல்.
See *Puṛam,* 61, 116, 248, 340. *Cintāmaṇi,* 66.

married couple born out of harmonious life of enjoyment at home. *Puṟam,* on the other hand, means anything that could be experienced by others as well as the institutions of state and society. If *Aham* is love, *Puṟam* is war. These two are essential factors of life. While the Sanskritists speak of four objects of life, Dharma (*aṟam*), Artha (*poruḷ*), Kāma (*iṉbam*), and Mōkṣa (*vīḍu*), the Tamil literature speaks of only the first three objects and omits *vīḍu* or mōkṣa. While *aṟam* and *poruḷ* form *puṟam, iṉbam* comes under the category of *Aham*. Accordingly we have a collection of anthologies *Ahanāṉūṟu* and *Puṟanāṉūṟu*. It is Tiruvaḷḷuvar who makes a clear presentation of the *trivarga* of Sanskrit literature. In this immortal work the *Kuṟaḷ*, he makes a three-fold division, *aṟam, poruḷ* and *iṉbam*.[1]

Forms of marriage.—Sanskrit writers on the subject of marriage mention eight kinds of marriage: *brāhma, daiva, ārṣa, prājāpatya, āsura, gāndharva, rākṣasa* and *paiśāca*.[2]

This means that eight forms of marriage were prevalent in the epoch of the *Dharmasūtras* and *Dharmaśāstras*. A comparative study of this institution and that of the ancient Tamils is both interesting and instructive. In the Tamiḻagam, two forms of marriage were normal in earliest times though the Tamils were familiar with these eight forms by the time of the Tolkāppiyaṉār. These two forms of the marriage-institution were the *kaḷavu* and the *kaṟpu*. These are difficult terms to translate and may be roughly rendered as 'marriage in secrecy' and 'marriage overt.'[3] The

[1] Cf. *Seṉ Tamiḻ*, vol. 8, pp. 539-40.

[2] ब्राह्मो दैवस्तथैवार्षः प्राजापत्यस्तथासुरः ।
गान्धर्वो राक्षसश्चैव पैशाचश्चाष्टमोऽधमः ॥ Manu, iii. 21.

[3] I have translated them as 'pre-nuptial love' and 'post-nuptial love' in my *Hindu Administrative Institutions*, pp. 36-7.

tribes who originally inhabited this part of India seem to have been the hill and forest tribes among whom the normal form of marriage was *kaḷavu*. Before regular marriage was celebrated, it was a peculiar custom that a certain person met secretly an unmarried girl and made overtures of love to her. This state of suspense continued till her parents came to know of this and got her married to her lover. This may roughly be said to correspond to the *gāndharva* form of marriage. Mr. Thurston who has made a special study of the aboriginal tribes in different parts of South India mentions how even to-day a relic of this practice still lingers with some of the tribes in Ganjam, Coimbatore and Trivandrum.[1]

In the age of Tolkāppiyaṉār.—Under the category of *Ahattiṇai* treating of different forms of love and marriage, Tolkāppiyaṉār makes a three-fold classification, *kaikkiḷai, aintiṇai* and *peruntiṇai*.[2] Let us examine the forms of love and marriage under each of these heads. *Kaikkiḷai* is that form of love where either the lover alone or the loved alone exhibits his or her passion respectively. This love is not reciprocated by the other party. Hence it is known as one-sided love[3] (*orutalaikkāmam*). Three kinds of this form are again distinguished. The first is the case of a lover who approaches an immature girl and expresses his love to her. This immature girl is termed *pēdai* while the mature girl is termed *pedumbai*.[4] The second division of the *kaikkiḷai* form of love is where

1 *Ethnographic notes in Southern India,* p. 131.

2 A detailed and excellent survey of this topic is made by M. Rāghava Ayyangar in his book *Tolkāppiyapporuḷadikāra ārāycci.* (Second Edition 1929).

3 ஒருதலைக்காமம்.

4 பெதும்பை.

Cf. *Aham* 7. This kind of love to an immature girl is evident from the *sūtra* (50) of the *Tolkāppiyam* காமஞ் சாலா இளமையோளிடம் ரிகழ்வது.

the lover and the loved are equally anxious for union with each other but the actual union is postponed. The characteristics of this form are thus mentioned: accidental meeting,[1] reflections on the lady whether she was a goddess or a human being,[2] anxiety relieved as he comes to know that she is only a human being,[3] overtures of love by gestures of eyes, etc.[4] The third division of the love under the heading *kaikkiḷai* is evident from the *sūtra* 105. This is known in literature as *Kollēṟukōḍal* or simply *ēṟukōḍal*. This was largely in vogue in the *mullai* region. The custom among the members of the community of cowherds was to let loose a rude bull declaring that he who would catch hold of it with success was the lawful husband of the maiden in whose honour the said event was fixed up.[5] This reminds us of the breaking of the bow by the epic hero Rāma and his consequent marriage to Sītā in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. These forms of the *Kaikkiḷai* roughly correspond to the *asura, rākṣasa,* and the *paiśāca* forms of the Hindu legal literature.[6]

The second great division is Aintiṇai or correlation to natural regions.—It has been contended with some truth that the course which each form of love or marriage took was generally affected by the geographical conditions of the land. We know that the ancient Tamils distinguished five regions (*tiṇais*): *kuṟiñji, neydal, mullai, pālai* and *marudam*. These names were given probably after the trees or flowers which grew abundantly in the respective regions. Social life in these five regions is an interesting study. Though there was much that was

[1] காட்சி. [2] ஐயம். [3] தெளிதல். [4] தேறல். See also *sūtra* 62. See also 94-6.

[5] See *Kali*, 70, 71, etc.

[6] For other details of *Kaikkiḷai* love, the reader is referred to the three stanzas of *Kalittogai*, 56-8.

common in the daily life of the people who occupied the five *tiṇais* still these differed from one another in certain customs and practices, social and religious. The *Kuṛiñji* is a hilly tract of land where Nature enraptures her inhabitants by her romantic scenery. The *Kaḷaviyal* form of marriage leading to immediate consummation was common in these hilly parts. *Neydal* is the maritime region where the woman passes anxious days and nights in expectation of her husband gone to far-off lands in quest of trade. *Mullai* is pasture ground, and here perhaps even separation of lovers for a short time was a source of anguish and anxiety. For the cowherds leave with their cattle for the grazing grounds and return only in the evening after a day's strenuous work. *Pālai* is the desert region where the separation of the lover from his beloved is so inevitable. In a desert region where nothing could be got a man had to go out to earn a livelihood for himself and his family. Here both *kaḷavu* and *kaṛpu* forms were prevalent. Lastly *marudam* is the fertile region where people lead a settled life of ease and peace. Here the normal form of marriage prevails. This might be the region where the *kaṛpiyal* form of marriage was popular as also the *mullai* and the *neydal* regions.[1]

The *Perumtiṇai* is the third great division of *Ahattiṇai* of the *Tolkāppiyam*. This division treats of unequal love matches and their evil consequences. This is also of different varieties.[2] Some of them are, first, for a lover to go in for a lady more aged than himself, secondly, the forcible seizure of a lady by one who meets her by sheer accident with a view to satisfy his carnal lust; and thirdly to violently love a certain lady who is not only unwilling to return his love but sternly

[1] See Nambi: *Ahapporuḷviḷakkam. Śen Tamiḻ* publication, (1913).
[2] See *sūtra* 51.

refuses in spite of all overtures on his part. The last form of love is so violent on the part of the lover that he threatens her with his resolution to give up his life. This invoking of voluntary death went by the name of *maḍalēṟudal*[1] and *varaipāydal*.[2] The *Tolkāppiyam* gives it the name of *Ēṟiyamaḍaṟṟiṟam*[3] while the later Tamil literature refers to this simply as *maḍal*. This seems to be the peculiar Tamil custom of very ancient days. Maddened by love for a particular lady, the lover causes a cart of palmyra stem and a horse of jagged edges of palmyra leaf-stalks to be made, and seats himself naked on the horse, painting his whole body with ash. He has in his hand a picture of the lady-love drawn not by artists but by himself, with his eyes steadfast on it. He adorns himself with the garland made of bones of cats and flowers of *Calotropis gigantea*.[4] He thus rides through the public thoroughfare, and halts there foodless and sleepless, regardless of rain and sun. Either he is married or executed.[5]

This peculiar convention mentioned in the Śaṅgam literature gave birth in later times to what is known as *maḍal* literature of which the extant works are the *Periya-tirumaḍal* and *Śiṟiya-tirumaḍal* of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. This idea of absorbed passion for a lady love and the resolution to give up one's life on her not yielding to one's wishes, has been pressed into service by the mystic poets and poetesses who yearned for the indissoluble and eternal union with the God-love for whom

1 மடலேறுதல். 2 வரைபாய்தல்.

3 ஏறியமடற்றிறம். 4 எருக்கு

5 Cp. *Naṟṟiṇai*, 220; *Kuṟuntogai* 17, 173, 182 and 186. *Kalittogai* (neytaṟkali), stanzas 21, 22 and 24. E. Thurston informs us that some practice of this kind is now prevalent among the Badaga community of the Nilgiri Hill tribes. (*Ethnographic Notes*, p. 21.) See also *Tañjai-vāṇaṉ-kōvai*, p. 89 (ed. 1893), though the account here given has no basis in ancient literature.

they bore infinite and indescribable passion of devotion and faith.[1]

An interesting question has been raised by the celebrated author of the *Tolkāppiyam* whether this practice of *maḍalērudal* was proper in the case of women also. He himself answers with a simple No.[2] Thus the ancient practice of *maḍal* was confined only to men and was not prevalent among women. Tamil ladies were either not fired by such blind passion or were unwilling to take up such extreme steps. From aught we know of the heroic mothers and sisters of the Tamil *Nāḍu* we may assume that passionate lust of a violent kind did not animate them as was the case with men.[3]

The varieties of love-marriages under the category of the *Perumtiṇai* may favourably compare, according to Iḷampūraṇar, another distinguished commentator on the *Tolkāppiyam,* with the Brāhma, Prājāpatya, Ārṣa and Daiva forms of marriage mentioned in the Hindu law-books.[4] Tolkāppiyaṉār furnishes us with further details in regard to the main divisions of

[1] This has been already referred to in the chapter on *Some Tamil Mystic Poets.*

[2] see *sūtra* 35, cp. *Kuṛaḷ.*
கடலன்ன காம முழந்து மடலேறாப்
பெண்ணிற் பெருந்தக்க தில்.

[3] (See also Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār *Periya-tirumaḍal*).
*   *   காமத்தின்
மன்னும் வழிமுறையே நிற்றுநா மானோக்கின்
அன்ன நடையா ரலரேச வாடவர்மேல்
மன்னு மடலூரா ரென்பதோர் வாசகமுந்
தென்னுரையிற் கேட்டறிவ துண்டதனை யாந்தெளியோம்
மன்னும் வடநெறியே வேண்டினோம்.

[4] See the gloss on *Tolk. Ahat.,*
பெருந்திணை 'நடுவணைந்திணையாகிய ஒத்த காமத்தின் மிக்குங் குறைந்தும் வருதலானும், எண்வகை மணத்தினும் பிரமம் பிராசாபத்தியம் ஆரிடம் தெய்வமென்பன அத்திணைப்பாற் படுதலானும், இந்நான்குமணமும் மேன்மக்கள் மாட்டு நிகழ்தலானும், இவை உலகினுட் பெருவழக்கெனப் பயின்று வருதலானும் அது பெருந்திணை எனக் கூறப்பட்டது.'

kaḷaviyal and *kaṟpiyal*. The *kaḷavu* division constitutes the following four stages of love:—

(1) Union of lovers brought about by fate.[1]

(2) Second union of lovers at the place of their first meeting.[2]

(3) Lover's union with love through the agency of his associate.[3]

(4) Lover's union with love through the agency of her associate.[4]

The first class is otherwise known as *daivappuṇarcci*,[5] *muṉṉuṟupuṇarcci*.[6] and *kāmappuṇarcci*.[7] Here the lover and the lady love meet accidentally. The latter is such a charming damsel that he at first suspects her to be a goddess. From various signs and independent sources, his anxiety is relieved and he boldly advances his love-request to her, followed by the parting scene.

The second stage is reached when the lover feels keenly the separation and resolves to meet her the next day at the same time and place. The lady love entertains the same feelings and goes out the next morning. Both meet and are happy only inwardly. She is overcome by shame to openly express her joy. Under the pretence of driving away from her face a bee, he touches her body technically termed *meytoṭṭuppayiṟal*.[8] Soon her friends appear on the scene and there is an abrupt separation. The third stage is when he meets

1 இயற்கைப் புணர்ச்சி.

2 இடந்தலைப்பாடு.

3 பாங்கற் கூட்டம்.

4 தோழியிற் கூட்டம். See *sūtra*, 499.

5 தெய்வப் புணர்ச்சி.

6 முன்னுறு புணர்ச்சி. See *Tirukkōvai*, 18.

7 காமப் பு See *sūtra*, 102.

8 மெய்தொட்டுப் பயிறல்.

next his companion to whom he narrates what all has happened. He is moved and offers like a knight-errant to meet his lady love and remove his agony of suspense. The companion sees her without her knowledge, and returning asks his friend to meet her. Just then her friends disturb the scene and once more they part. The last stage is when the maid-in-attendance of the mistress plays a conspicuous part and hence known as *tōḻiyiṟ-kūṭṭam.* The lover feels the difficulty of getting at her and resolves to engage the services of her maid-in-attendance. He approaches her and first understands her mind. She is aware of her mistress's passion for him. After taking her into his confidence he gives out his ideas about her mistress. She receives these though not warmly. On this he expresses his resolution of *maḍalēṟudal.*[1] This generates fear in her heart and she therefore arranges for their meeting in solitude. Now the outward manifestation of love is exhibited by both. Then she returns to where her maid had gone as if to cull a flower from the neighbouring creeper house. This continues for days together, sometimes in the day and sometimes in the night.[2]

A few days thus pass by and the maid is afraid that the matter would be divulged. Hence she asks the lover to marry her mistress.[3] Finding him indifferent the mistress pines away and becomes pale. Her parents ignorant of what had happened treat her for some illness or other. Diviners and sorcerers are consulted. Oblations are offered to the deities. Finally she is deemed to be love-sick and her wedding is arranged with some other than the object of her love. The maid informs the lover of this and arranges for the secret escape of

[1] *Sūtra,* 102. [2] *Ibid.,* 130.

[3] வரைவு கடாதல்.

the mistress with the connivance of the nurse. The elopement becomes public and her kith and kin pursue the couple, but finding their daughter firmly attached to her lover, return home.[1] Then the marriage is celebrated and both the master and the mistress lead the happy life of the householder.

The next form of marriage, that was perhaps more popular in the epoch of the *Tolkāppiyam* is the *kaṛpiyal*. Here the marriage is arranged by the parents of both the parties and celebrated with all ceremonials and rites.[2] It would appear that *kaṛpiyal* is the consequence of *kaḷaviyal* which is the more original form of love and marriage. In the epoch preceding that of the *Tolkāppiyam*, the different varieties of *kaḷaviyal* were prevalent with the result that they came to be abused in course of time. From the simple form of love at first sight it grew into the complex institution that it was, during the age in which our celebrated grammarian flourished. What were the circumstances which contributed to this complexity at the cost of ancient simplicity? They are set forth in the *Tolkāppiyam* itself. The *gāndharva* system degenerated slowly but surely into the *rākṣasa* form as is evident from the phrase *makaṭpāṛkāñci*[3] according to which a person carried off his lady love by sheer force even when she did not agree to live with him.[4] Again falsehood, dishonesty and treachery entered into the system and spoiled the simple marriage organization.[5] These evils increased

[1] *Sūtra* 40. [2] *Ibid.*, 142.

[3] மகட்பாற் காஞ்சி.

[4] *Sūtra*, 79, ll. 14–15.

[5] பொய்யும் வழுவுந் தோன்றிய பின்னர்
ஐயர் யாத்தனர் கரணம் என்ப—*Tol. Karp. Sūtra* 4.
மேலோர் மூவர்க்கும் புணர்த்த கரணம்
கீழோர்க் காகிய காலமும் உண்டே. (*Ibid.* 3.)

in a predominatingly high degree that the guardians of society felt the need of certain conventions which would be binding on all the members of the community. They were already aware of the system in vogue among the first three communities and its advantages in ensuring peace and goodwill among the members of the society. Thus was ushered in the complex institution of marriage, which in course of time came to be recognized by the society at large.

It would not be out of place here to examine the different stages of the *kaṟpiyal* form of marriage as mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam*.[1] According to this *sūtra*, the following are categorically the stages which mark the even course of this *kaṟpu* institution:—

1. The first is known as *maṟai-veḷippaḍutal*[2] which occurred when a person took his lady love to his home with no interruption from her relatives, though the latter came to know of it, and then arranged for the regular marriage with the consent of his parents. The wedding took place after the mistress went through the vowed observance *śilambukaḻi nōṉbu*.[3]

2. The second stage of this marriage was *tamariṟ-peṟutal*.[4] Having come to know that their daughter had been carried off by such and such a person to such and such a place after a few days of their departure, her near and dear ones visited their daughter. When they understood that she approved of her master, the lover, they invited him to go over to their place and get the marriage celebrated in pomp and splendour.

Thus whether the marriage was celebrated in the house of the bride or bridegroom the usual time for the

[1] *Sūtra* 500.
[2] மறை வெளிப்படுதல்.
[3] See *Naṟṟiṇai*, 279.
சிலம்புகழி நோன்பு.
[4] தமரிற் பெறுதல்.

celebration was four days. Three days were devoted to ceremonials and fasting, and the fourth day to the final consummation of the marriage as is evident from the sūtra, 146.[1]

3. After the regular marriage, was the period of enjoyment *malivu*.[2] During this time both of the newly-married young pair spent their days in ease and happiness.

4. Next was the period of misunderstanding *pulavi*.[3] This is explained by the *Paripāḍal*.[4] According to this, the master begins to bestow his love on the prostitutes of the locality and spends all his time with them, little caring for his wedded wife. While maintaining steadfast her chastity during this temporary separation from her husband, she prayed to the Lord to bestow the right wisdom on her husband. Mediators were not wanting to bring him round to the righteous path. These were twelve in number; the maid of the mistress, mother, Brahmana, his friend, pāṇaṉ, his wife pāṇiṉi, messenger, guest, musician, dancer, astrologer and visitor. The *Kalittogai* adds the thirteenth mediator, the washerwoman.[5]

5. The next incident goes by the name of *ūḍal*.[6] The period of misunderstanding continues indefinitely and the more affected of the parties is the lover who is prepared for rapprochement at any cost. The mistress is stern and unbending. She feels that she has been badly treated for no reason of hers. An example of this is furnished by Pugaḻēndiyar in *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam* where the queen of the Cōḻa king is said to have extended the period of *ūḍal*.[6]

1 காரணத்தி னமைந்து முடிந்த காலை
நென்சுதளை யவிழ்ந்த புணர்ச்சி
2 மலிவு.
3 புலவி.
4 See ll. 16-18.
5 72, 4.
6 ஊடல். *Kalvi*, 50.
7 See *Kuraḷ*, 1303.

6. Yet another incident is what is known as *uṇartal.*[1] The messengers notice the stubbornness on the part of the lady love and the increasing repentence on the part of the erring master. They actively go to both the parties and effect a reconciliation. Another incident in the *kaṟpiyal* form, which is of course common in domestic life, is separation (*pirivu*) which is sometimes necessary and sometimes unnecessary. Generally, separation was of five kinds.[2] These are separation for higher studies, for the sake of the country, during war, being appointed as messengers, for the sake of the Government, and for earning wealth.

After the separation, comes again the domestic life of joy and happiness. Thus we see these factors are incidental to wedded life and both the husband and the wife must be prepared to face them. The *Kuṟaḷ,* as we shall see presently, devotes nearly 15 chapters to the agony of suspense on both sides during this period of separation, wanton or otherwise. Both live in the hope that in the near future they will again meet and enjoy the bliss natural to a wedded couple.

In the age of the Kuṟaḷ.—The *Tirukkuṟaḷ* which we have fixed at the second century B.C. is not far removed in time from the *Tolkāppiyam,* which we have just examined. Tiruvaḷḷuvar devotes the third book of the *Kuṟaḷ* to the subject of *iṉbam* or *kāma.* It is divided into 25 chapters of 10 distichs each. A study of these verses shows that Vaḷḷuvar has not made any departure in the treatment of his subject. He has largely followed the celebrated grammarian in his two main divisions of *kaḷavu* and *kaṟpu.* This confirms our opinion that in Vaḷḷuvar's time, the customs had not changed and the

[1] உணர்தல்.

[2] ஓதல், பகை, தூது, வேந்தற்குற்றுழி, பொருள்.

institution remained almost the same. Referring to this section, the Rev. G. U. Pope remarks: 'These last chapters must be considered as an Eastern romance not fully told, but indicated in a number of beautiful verses which leave much to the imagination of the reader and the ingenuity of the interpreter. Taken as they are, these chapters are worthy of Theocritus, and much less open to objection than parts of his writings. Like the verses of Bhartṛhari and other Sanskrit writers, these *kuṟaḷs* merely portray isolated situations without any connection as a whole'.[1]

Kaḷavu can roughly be compared to the Gāndharva system of marriage. This is love at first sight. There are seven chapters devoted to this. The first refers to the youth seeing a beautiful maiden and falling in love with her.[2] In the second he recognizes love in her signs and is relieved of the mental worry (*kuṟippaṟital*). In the third the maid in attendance observes this and arranges for their meeting alone. They meet and are happy (*puṇarcci-magiḻtal*).[3] The fourth chapter treats of his mad passion for the maiden whose beauty he extols.[4] The following chapter deals with separation and its troubles.[5] It is unbearable, and the youth sees no other way for reunion than the use of *maḍal* by which his love is avowed by him in the public street in a wailing mood.[6] Then the parents come to know of this and get them married,[7] thus relieving them of their anxiety.

The next seventeen chapters have for their theme the *Kaṟpiyal* or wedded love. Here the different incidents

[1] The *Sacred Kuṟaḷ*, Oxford, 1886, p. 22.
[2] தகையணங்குறுத்தல்
[3] புணர்ச்சி மகிழ்தல்
[4] நலம்புனைந்துரைத்தல்
[5] காதற்சிறப்புரைத்தல்
[6] புலம்பல்
[7] நாணுத்துறவுரைத்தல் and அலரறிவுறுத்தல்.

natural to such married life are portrayed with all due excellence. One such incident is separation. The seeming bliss is broken. The mistress feels it keenly. Even to bid farewell to her beloved is impossible. She has already become emaciated so much so that her bracelet slips down. He has left the place out of necessity and she passes wakeful nights. Her eyes are consumed with grief. She becomes pale and thin and cannot endure the agony. Both, separated, dream of past joys and recall them to their sad memories which further tell on their health. She tries to control herself but looks forward with hope to meet him. His return is announced and it brings sunshine to her much-affected heart.[1]

Soon clouds seem to gather and prevent the long-felt sunshine. She notices signs in him which are not conducive to happy family life. There are certain misunderstandings but a reconciliation is effected.[2] The next incident is sulking[3] when both are seemingly angry.[4] The theme of the last chapter is in the words of Pope 'the pleasures of temporary variance'. The lover grows jealous but the youth knows it is only feigned jealousy and offers terms for conciliation. This is effected and it brings peace and solace to both the parties.[5]

Thus there is much in common with the incidents mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam* showing Vaḷḷuvar's indebtedness to his predecessor.

The epoch of the Epics.—It will be now interesting to describe the systems of marriage life in the time of the twin epics *Śilappadikāram* and the *Maṇimēkalai* generally assigned to the second century after Christ.

Marriage in high life.—Almost in the early centuries of Christian era the marriage customs and rites were

[1] *Kuṛaḷ*, 1151 to 1270. [2] *Ibid.*, 1281-1300. [3]
[4] *Kuṛaḷ*, 1301 to 1320. [5] *Ibid.*, 1321 to 1330.

not very different from what they are now. That tradition persists in this land, there is no gainsaying. The marriage described in the Tamil classic *Śilappadikāram* is between the son of a wealthy merchant and the daughter of an equally wealthy merchant of Pūmpuhār in the days of the Karikāṟcōḻaṉ. Apparently these contracting parties belonged to the powerful and influential Vaiśya community. It is obvious that the *varṇāśrama dharma* system had come to stay in Tamil India in the beginning of the Christian era though we are not in a position to say when it was ushered into this part of ancient India. According to the prescription of *Manu* and other law-givers, a girl of twelve was married to a boy of sixteen. To-day we are having legislation for raising the marriageable age of boys and girls. The good old custom of the land seems to have fixed it at sixteen and twelve. But it may be remarked that different ages are prescribed for the members or different classes. But still the age mentioned in this work appears to be the normal one.

It was not a love marriage. The choice of finding out husbands for girls and wives for boys rested entirely with the parents. Social and physical accomplishments were indeed qualifications which fixed finally the happy consummation. Parents of both the parties conferred and agreed finally. The *Purōhita* fixed an auspicious day for the celebration. On that day or perhaps previous to that day, invitations were issued to all the people in the city. The form of invitation was peculiar. Elderly women belonging to both parties in splendid attire, mounted on elephants, went in procession throughout the streets of the city and extended cordial invitations to every one to be present on the occasion. The procession was accompanied by a music party. Various musical instruments

were employed as befitting the great occasion. Drums, violins and *mṛdaṅgams* were the chief. *Śaṅkha* was another musical instrument used.

Marriage pandal.—The marriage hall was gaily decorated, and it presented the appearance of an Indra Sabhā. The pillars of the hall were set with diamonds and rubies of priceless value. There were hangings of flowers on the top of these pillars. The hall was covered by an exquisitely beautiful canopy of blue silk. Long rows of wooden columns supported the whole *pandal*. The floor was covered with fresh white sand so as to keep cool and pleasant. Apparently there was no covering spread over this floor of sand. It may be that the guests and visitors used the floor as it was. Some of these descriptions are found in the *Ahanāṉūṟu*, especially in stanzas 86 and 136.

The religious function.—This was the most important factor of the whole. The party leading the marriage procession entered the *pandal* at the time appointed. The auspicious time was usually when the asterism Rōhiṇi was in conjunction with the Moon according to the *Ahanāṉūṟu* also. At that time and as directed by the *Purōhita* who was an aged and learned member of the Brahmana caste, the regular ceremonials began. The rites were purely Vēdic and the important ritual was circumambulation of the fire-altar specially made for that purpose in the midst of a vast concourse of people, the *Purōhita* chanting *mantras*. Yet another important function is the tying of *tāli* round the neck of the bride by the bridegroom.[1] The major portion of the people present were the members of the fair sex. We need not say that women play a prominent part even in the present-day marriages. Elderly ladies then attended

[1] *Puṟam*, 127.

generally to the technique of the marriage rites. Some carried spices, others flowers. Some sang the glories of the couple, some carried sandal paste and others frankincense. Some carried scented powders and others pots of *pālikai* with seeds sprouting from them. With similar auspicious objects like petals of flowers and rice grains for benediction and blessing, women watched the proceedings with glee and love. The religious rites over, there came the turn of every damsel interested in the well-being of the couple, to shower her blessings without stint. Sprinkling of holy water, throwing rice, grains, and flowers on the heads of the young bride and bridegroom were some of the ostentatious ways in which benediction was offered. Every one of them wished them everlasting happiness. The bride particularly was the recipient of innumerable blessings from every side. The blessing was couched in words full of sparkling joy and hearty love: 'Be loyal and devoted to your husband both in word and deed. Do not slip even by an inch from the excellent and unrivalled path of chastity and purity both in mind and body; earn a name in the world as Arundhatī, the illustrious wife of the sage Vasiṣṭha.'

The final blessings.—These ceremonies over, the newly-married girl and her husband were taken to the bedroom decorated and ornamented with special cots and beds. On their entering the chamber, blessings were once again showered on them as 'the gentle dew that droppeth from heaven.' The function came to a close with a prayer for the welfare of the king of the land. This answers excellently to the *āśīrvāda* rite nowadays when good wishes are exchanged and the king's welfare is invoked. For it is the king of the land who promotes the good of his subjects. Promotion of social practices

and progress of the world depend to a large extent on the peace and security of the land. And it is the king who guarantees orderly progress. Hence special significance is attached to praying for the king's health. It may be noted in passing that the consummation-marriage was celebrated the same day. Hence it is reasonable to assume that such marriages were post-puberty marriages. There is evidence in some *Dharmaśāstras* that such marriages were once extant and even legal. But later on they have been prohibited as is evident from the later legal literature.

Sec. IV. DANCING, MUSIC AND OTHER AMUSEMENTS

Art arises from the play impulse in man. Art is both static and dynamic. Dynamic arts are arts of movement and rhythm, such as music and dancing. Music arises as an art from a spontaneous desire for the vocal expression of human emotions, and dance for the physical expression of such emotions. It has been well said that 'music is the dance of words and dance is the music of human limbs'.[1] The chief aspects of dramaturgy according to Indian rhetoricians are *nāṭya* or dance, *rūpa* or scenic representation, and *rūpaka* or regular play. The ancient Tamils seem to have achieved the first two aspects of dramaturgy to a large extent. We have not been able to discover yet any actual dramatic compositions belonging to the so-called Śaṅgam age.

Legendary origin.—In the *Śilappadikāram,* belonging to the category of Śaṅgam classics, there is a reference to the origin of this institution. It would appear that once Indra, the King of the Gods, gave a royal audience to

[1] See K. S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri *Indian Æsthetics,* p. 139.

the distinguished guests, sages, and seers in his ideally decorated *durbar* hall. Jayanta, son of Indra, was also present besides a number of heavenly actresses and dancing women like Rambhā, Ūrvaśī and others. When the *sabhā* was in session and in the presence of distinguished persons and sages, Jayanta and Ūrvaśī are said to have misbehaved in a manner that enraged the sage Agastya. The sage felt that such misbehaviour under those circumstances deserved condign punishment. Hence he pronounced a curse to the effect that Jayanta should be born as a bamboo stick in the Vindhya mountains, and that Ūrvaśī should be born on the earth as a courtesan. But both of them fell at the feet of the wise sage, regretted their fault and begged his pardon. He would not go back on his word, but would mitigate its rigour. From that time forward the sage said that the institution of dancing would become popularly identified with Jayanta and that from Ūrvaśī would come into being a line of dancing girls and actresses in the world. So it had become a custom even at the time of the composition of the *Śilappadikāram* for dancing girls to trace their descent from the heavenly Ūrvaśī. It is also obvious that there was a recognized work on the art of dancing known as the *Jayanta* perhaps answering to the *Bharatanāṭyaśāstra* in Sanskrit. Apparently the work is now lost.

The Talaikkōl.—The name Jayanta is further celebrated in the ceremony and worship of *Talaikkōl*[1] which is an important feature of all dancing recognized in early times. In the middle of the stage specially constructed for dancing was a bamboo stick adorned with pearls and precious stones and encased in unalloyed gold, symbolical of Jayanta, perhaps the first dancer

1 தலைக்கோல்.

on the earth. It was kept in the central place so as to be clearly seen by all members of the audience sitting in front of the stage. This pole was generally the bamboo stick which formed the handle of the white umbrella of an enemy king. Usually when the enemy king was defeated, it was the practice of the victor to appropriate some emblems of his sovereignty so as to show that he was the victor, and the enemy, the vanquished. One of such spoils of war was the white umbrella of the monarch. When once it became the property of the conquering king, he removed the stick that supported it and located it in a separate room in his palace as an object of worship.

On the day appointed for dance this sacred pole was duly washed with the holy waters brought in a golden pitcher. It was then adorned with garlands of pearls and flowers of different colours. It was afterwards taken in procession through the principal streets of the city on the back of the State elephant. The party leading this procession finally reached the dancing stage and had the stick once again located in the centre of the stage. It was a custom that the actress of the day must first worship this stick, for it represented, as already said, the first dancer on the earth. The stick was nor merely a decorative ornament. It was used during action. The actress took the holy stick and placed it on her head perhaps to serve as an equipoise when regular dancing began.

Primitive dancing.—That dancing which went by different names, *āṭṭam, kūttu, kuṉippu* was a recognized mode of amusement among the ancient Tamils is evident. In fact dancing was a marked feature of every incident in the life of the ancient people. It was a sure accompaniment of every joy of life and a means of efficacy

in prayer. From the earliest available literature, the *Tolkāppiyam*, we can gather that dancing[1] was a primitive institution indulged in by all classes of people. From the *sūtras*[2] (60) and (76), it is obvious that there were two kinds of dancing named *Vaḷḷikkūttu* and *Kaḻaṉilaikkūttu*.[3] *Vaḷḷikkūttu* is perhaps in honour of Vaḷḷi, the consort of God Murugaṉ, the War-God. This *kūttu* was popular among the lower classes of society. *Kaḻāṉilaikkūttu* was of a higher order. This *kūttu* was arranged in honour of a young soldier who stood boldly in the front rank of the army and offered stout fight while others retreated. On his victorious return, it was usual that his friends presented him with what is known as *vīrakkaḻal* an anklet, and indulged in a dance. Besides these two *kūttus* there was one other which was known as *āṭal*. The sūtra (60) of the *Puṟattiṇaiyiyal* refers to *Vēlaṉveṟiyāṭal*.[4] The chief feature of this dance was to offer *bali* or animal sacrifice to the God Muruga, and in the course of such worship, one got possessed with the spirit of the God and began to dance. Others in the crowd responded by joining in it. Generally it was held with a view to find out the nature of the trouble which a certain person was ailing from and also to get at some remedy for the same.[5] There was another kind of *āṭal* which forms one of the twelve *tuṟais*[6] under the sub-division of *tumbaittiṇai* in the section on the *Puṟattiṇaiyiyal* of the *Tolkāppiyam*. It points to one method of celebrating a fellow-king fallen dead[7] heroically in the field of action. It was a custom then

[1] நாடக வழக்கு or different kinds of dancing
[2] வெறியறி சிறப்பின் வெவ்வாய் வேலன்
வெறியாட் டயர்ந்த காந்தளும்.
[3] கழனிலைக் கூத்து. [4] வேலன் வெறியாடல்
[5] See for details of this *Kūttu* the *Tirumurugārruppadai*, ll 222-4.
[6] துறை. [7] முன்தேர்க்குரவை பின்தேர்க்குரவை.

that when once the king who led the host fell in battle, to whatever side he might belong, other kings stopped the fight, surrounded the dead body, and honoured it by a kind of dancing in which skilled sword play was a feature.[1]

Thus we see that both ritual dancing and war-dance were characteristic features of the Śaṅgam age as is evidenced by the *Tolkāppiyam*. From the rude methods of *āṭṭam* and *kūttu* which were of different kinds, there evolved perhaps a kind of dumb show in which ideas were expressed by different postures and gestures. This became in course of time popular, and began to stay as an institution. Though there was a development in the art of dancing, still the old kinds of *kūttu* and others died hard. They continued to exist side by side with the new institution.

Ritual dance, for example, is prominently mentioned in the accredited Śaṅgam works. It was inseparably connected with primitive modes of worship, much older than the epoch of the *Tolkāppiyam*. We have already seen it referred to by the grammarian. The references to it in the *Kuṟuntogai*, *Maduraikkāñci* and the *Śilappadikāram* show its popularity even in the Śaṅgam age. Especially the worship of Murugaṉ and Māyōṉ had the dance as a relieving feature of the occasion. So also the worship of Koṟṟavai (Durgā). The ritual dance associated with the worship of Murugaṉ went by the names of *veṟiyāṭal* and *vēlaṉāṭal*. The priest who bore the *vēl*, a spear, in his hands and who was a symbolic representative of the Vēlaṉ, another name for the War-God, offered

1 ஆளுங் குரிசி லுவகைக் களவென்னும்
கேளன்றிக் கொன்றாரே கேளாகி—வாள்வீசி
ஆடினார் ஆர்த்தார் அடிதோய்ந்த மண்வாங்கிச்
சூடினார் வீழ்ந்தானைச் சூழ்ந்து.

worship to the God Muruga in the then accepted ways. The method by which the God is invited to partake of the *bali* offering is described in an ode in the *Kuruntogai*.[1] That the *bali* offering consisted chiefly of cooked rice and the meat of a sheep is evident from the *Maduraik-kāñci*.[2]

The religious dance bound up with the worship of Viṣṇu goes by the name of *Kuḍam*.[3] It is a form of ancient worship of Lord Kṛṣṇa. These dances were primarily conducted by the members of the cowherd community. One example of this is found in the *Maduraik-kāṇḍam* of the *Śilappadikāram*. When the Pāṇḍyan king pronounced death sentence on the innocent Kōvalaṉ and he was killed, there were innumerable bad omens which indicated some impending calamity. The cowherd-women noticed these and began to pray to Lord Kṛṣṇa to avert the danger. The form of prayer is known as *Kuravaikkūttu*. It is a peculiar form of dance wherein either seven or nine women engage each joining her hands to those of another. It was not a mere dumb show for the women engaged in this dance also sang in praise of the Lord. Another example of the *Kuravaik-kūttu* is found in the same classical work. After Kaṇṇaki lost her husband, she left the city and went in the western direction along the *Vaigai* until she reached a hill in which was situated the village of Vēḍuvar. She stood underneath a *veṇgai* tree where the Vēḍuvar in large

[1] முருகயர்ந்து வந்த முதுவாய் வேலன்
சினவ லோம்புமதி வினவுத லுடையேன்
பல்வே றுருவிற் சில்லவிழ் மடையொடு
சிறுமறி கொன்றிவ ணறுநுதல் நீவி
வணங்கினை கொடுத்தி யாயி னணங்கிய
விண்டோய் மாமலைச் சிலம்பன்
ஒண்டா ரகலமு முண்ணுமோ பலியே. 362.

[2] ll. 611-17.

[3] குடக்கூத்து.

numbers waited on her. At that time Kōvalan appeared in divine form and took her away. This incident took those present on the occasion by surprise and they decided to venerate Kannaki as a goddess. In her honour they engaged in *Kuravaikkūttu* accompanied by music. The *Śilappadikāram* refers to another kind of ritual dance in connection with the worship of Korravai, the Goddess of Victory. This dance is called the *Vēṭṭuvavari* described in the opening lines of the canto xii. Here the person who offers worship is not the priest but the priestess of the Marava tribe. In the middle of the high street of the village, the priestess danced, as if possessed by the goddess, to the great surprise of those present.[1] She predicted what disasters awaited the village and how they could be averted. The same work refers to the dance of Śiva immediately after the burning of the Tripuram. It is known as *Koḍukoṭṭi*[2] or simply *Koṭṭi*.[3] Why this dance came to be known by this name is thus explained by the commentator Aḍiyārkkunallār. After having set fire to the Three Cities and when they were in flames, the Lord would not show mercy. On the other hand, He was so happy that he clapped His hands and indulged Himself in a dance.[4] Iḷaṅgō-Aḍigaḷ gives a fascinating description of this dance.

Period of training.—The *Śilappadikāram* contains quite an interesting and informing chapter furnishing us a wealth of details concerning the then extant music and dance. The musical instruments and the different kinds of musicians with their elaborate qualifications demonstrate beyond doubt to what degree musical science had advanced in the ancient Tamil land. At this time there

[1] See also *Puram*, 259.
[2] கொடுகொட்டி.
[3] கொட்டி.
[4] *Silap.*, canto vi, 43 *naḍukarkāḍai.*

was a dancing community as such. The practice was to train young girls of that community for a period of seven years from their fifth to their twelfth year. A number of experts in different branches of the art of movement and gesture were appointed to teach them. Among these teachers we can mark out the dancing master, the vocal musician, the composer of songs, the drummer, the flutist, and the *Vīṇa* master. At twelve, when the period of apprenticeship was over, the girl was to perform before the king at his assembly and obtain a certificate of proficiency in her art. Then and then alone she became a qualified actress. This incidentally shows that girls were educated in their respective hereditary professions under the direct guidance of experts, and education began from as early as the fifth year. What is true of one profession must be true of others also. Normally then we have to take it that the education of girls ceased when they attained the age of twelve.[1] In no way was the right kind of education neglected and this kept the standard of culture always at a high level.

The ancient stage.—Dancing of an improved kind seems to have been the ancient form of the Tamil drama. Traces of this primitive institution are still said to be lingering in Malabar, under the name of *kathakaḷi.* The institution reached a stage which necessitated a particular place, time and other favourable conditions. In a stage specially constructed for the purpose and in the presence of the king and the public, the girl gave a public exhibition of her skill in the expression of emotions, by singing and dancing until she won the royal approval. The stage was erected on a suitable site. It was in breadth 42 feet and in length 48 feet. The unit of measurement was a straight pole of bamboo, six feet in

[1] *Silap.*, canto iii, ll. 10-11, Commen.

length. From the ground floor and at a height of six feet from the ground was the stage on which took place the presentation of individual situations with of course, accompaniment of musical instruments. The full height of the stage was 24 feet. At the top was spread a canopy painted with pictures of different sizes. These pictures were symbolical representations of gods and demons worshipped by all castes of people.

There were two gateways, one for entrance and the other for exit. The pillars in the hall were so arranged as not to cast their shadows inside the stage. From pillar to pillar lights were artistically arranged. These were interspersed with hangings, some of pearls of dazzling brightness and others of flowers of various hues. At a fair distance from the entrance there were three screens hanging beautifully painted and decorated with many designs. One was a general screen which must be completely rolled up perhaps before any scenic representation. The second screen was of two different pieces of cloth open at the middle through which actors and actresses could freely come and go. The third was the secret screen which was meant for exhibiting gods and demons descending on the earth from heaven. The principal actress of the day took her stand near the right pillar while elderly ladies, incapacitated by old age, stood near the left pillar watching the representations on the stage, perhaps to check and correct whenever she erred. Those playing on different musical instruments took their appointed seats. The performance commenced with music. One could differentiate eleven kinds of time (*tāḷam*). Performance over, the king awarded presents to her according to the merits of the performance.

Music: Its antiquity.—There was no dancing if there was no singing. In other words singing was an

accompaniment of dancing, secular or religious. The popular name given to music in ancient literature is *iśai.* The traditional account of the three Śaṅgams contained in the commentary of the *Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ* mentions the names of ancient treatises on music like *Iśainuṇukkam, Śiṟṟiśai,* the *Mudu-nārai, Mudu-kurugu,* the *Pēriśai* which are now unfortunately lost to us. The mention of these ancient books is itself an evidence of the antiquity of the institution of music.

Singing may be vocal or instrumental or both. A number of musical instruments are referred to in the Śaṅgam literature, *iśaikkaruvi* being the general term. Four kinds of instruments are distinguished—*tōṛkaruvi* made of leather, *tuḷaikkaruvi* provided with holes, *narambukkaruvi* or stringed instruments and *midaṟṟuk-karuvi* or throat-instruments.[1] *Kuḻal* or the flute was the chief wind-instrument and was of various kinds. There were also different forms of trumpets of which the *kombu* was the most popular. Among the leather instruments forming the varieties of the drum are the *paṛai, murasu, pērikai* and others. Of the stringed instruments the *yāḻ* occupies a prominent place and is of different kinds. There is a very good description of the *yāḻ* in the *Porunarāṟṟuppaḍai*[2] and in another poem *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai.*[3] A variety of tunes *paṇ, paṇṇiyaṟṟiṟam, tiṟam, tiṟattiṟam* was developed perhaps after each region. Peculiar and special measures were beaten as befitted the different occasions, such as war-music, marriage-music, music connected with dances secular and religious, singing associated with festivals, with death, etc. There was a class of bards of both sexes who were professional singers and musicians—

[1]See *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture*, p. 40.
[2]ll. 4-18. [3]ll. 4-16.

pāṇar, viṟalis, etc. Most of them went from place to place dispensing music and thus earning their livelihood.[1]

The Tamilian genius for music is best illustrated by the *Śilappadikāram* where a whole canto[2] is devoted to various aspects of musical science. Besides the texts the commentary throws welcome light without which it is impossible to make out anything of ancient music. In this canto mention is made of two kinds of *kūttu*: *Ahakkūttu* and *Puṟakkūttu* and eleven kinds of *āṭal*. Then, a number of musical instruments are mentioned as well as the qualifications of a musician[3] and a composer of songs.[4] The musician exhibited his skill either by playing on the *vīṇā* or flute, or singing vocally, but in all cases accompanied by the low-toned *mṛdaṅgam*[5] and similar instruments.

The commentator refers here to four kinds of *vīṇā*—*pēriyāḻ*,[6] *makarayāḻ*[7] *śakōḍayāḻ*,[8] *śeṅgōṭṭiyāḻ*.[9] Speaking of the flute five kinds are distinguished according to the materials of which the flute was made. It was made of bamboo, sandalwood, bronze, red catechu and ebony. Of these, that of bamboo is the best, that of bronze middling and those of sandal, etc., are of inferior quality. Here seven holes are made for the seven *svaras*: *sa, ri, ga, ma, pa, da, ni,* and seven fingers are pressed into service when playing on the flute. The seven fingers are three of the left hand leaving out the thumb and the

[1] See *Perumpāṇāṟṟuppaḍai*, ll. 18-22

[2] Canto iii.

[3] இசையோன், l. 36.

[4] நன்னூற்புலவன், l. 44.
யாழுங் குழலுஞ் சீருமிடறுந்
தாழ்குரற் றண்ணுமை யாடலொ டிவற்றி
னிசைந்த பாட லிசையுடன் படுத்து. iii. ll. 26-8.

[5] தண்ணுமை.

[6] பேரியாழ்.

[7] மகரயாழ்.

[8] சகோடயாழ்.

[9] செங்கோட்டியாழ்.

little finger, and four of the right hand leaving out the thumb.[1]

Of the musical instruments which were accompaniments for any performance, thirty-one kinds[1-a] are distinguished. Apparently all of them are made of leather.

The songster must possess the instinct to divide and expand the *svaras* by distinguishing the foreign from the indigenous.[2] He and his assistants who are the drummer and others must be versed in *nāṭaka* literature which is divided into two parts,[3] one probably relating to the king, and the other (*Poduviyal*) relating to the populace.[4] The qualifications of a drummer,[5] of a flutist[6] and the *vīṇā* player[7] are elaborately explained. The drummer was to adjust his performance to that of the songster so that the latter might not feel the strain nor the

[1] Pp. 100-101, Ed. 1927.

[1 a] These are:—

பேரிகை, a variety of kettle-drum.
இடக்கை a doudle-headed drum.
மத்தளம் a kind of drum.
கரடிகை do.
குடமுழா an earthenware drum.
கணப்பறை a kind of drum.
தண்ணுமை do.
அந்தரி do.
சந்திரவளையம் do.
முரசு a variety of kettle-drum.
நிசாளம் one-headed drum.
சிறுபறை a small drum.
தகுணிச்சம் a kind of drum.
பாகம் do.
நாழிகைப்பறை do.
பெரும்பறை the big brum.
படகம் tom-tom.
உடுக்கை tambourine.
சல்லிகை a kind of large drum.
திமிலை the drum of fishermen.
தக்கை tabour.
தமருகம் a little drum.
தடாரி a kind of drum.
முழவு a drum in general.
மொந்தை a drum open at one end.
கண்விடு தூம்பு a kind of drum.
துடுமை a kind of drum.
அடக்கம் do.
விரலேறு do.
உபாங்கம் do.
துடி a small drum tapering from each end, forming a small neck in the centre

[2] கொளுத் துங்காலை,
வசையறு கேள்வி வகுத்தனன் விரிக்கும் *Śilap.*, canto iii, 11. 34—45,

[3] வேத்தியல்.

[4] பொதுவியல்.

[5] *Śilap.*, canto iii, 11, 45—55.

[6] *Ibid.*, 11. 56—69.

[7] *Ibid.*, 11. 70—94.

audience. He was to supply the deficiencies by a process of decrease and increase of his instrumental sound. His skill entirely depended on the continued practice.

The flutist is an expert in what is known as *cittirap-punarppu* which is nasalizing the hard consonants in singing a musical piece.[1] He must so use his fingers that his playing is conformable to the rules of the musical science.

The technicalities referred to in connection with a *vīṇā* performance are so subtle that it is difficult to render them in any other language. Of the fourteen *pālais* or tunes connected with this, skill consists in utilizing the seven tunes or airs at one and the same time. In conformity to these fourteen *pālais*, the sound was adjusted, four pertaining to the low key, seven equal, viz., neither low nor high, and three to the high pitch. From a study of this chapter it would appear that in the days of the *Śilappadikāram*, three kinds of musical performances were distinguished—the flute, the *vīṇā* and the vocal. These were served by a large number of accompanying instruments as occasion demanded.

Sec. V. SOME MORE CUSTOMS OF THE TAMILS

Doll festival.—In dealing with the mystic poetess Āṇḍāḷ,[2] we had occasion to refer to her celebrated work entitled *Tiruppāvai* and incidentally referred to the vowed observance of young girls entitled *Pāvai nōṉbu.* The commentator of the *Tiruppāvai* Periyavāccāṉ Pillai speaks of this festival as *Śiṣṭācāra*, and no ancient authority could be cited in tracing out its origin. The same festival is also referred to in the *Tiruvembāvai* of

[1] *Vañjaṉaip-punarppu* (வஞ்சனைப் புணர்ப்பு)
[2] See section Āṇḍāḷ in chapter iii of this book.

Tiruvādavūrar. Whatever might have been the origin of this festival, that it was celebrated by one and all of the unmarried girls is evident. The story goes that once when Lord Kṛṣṇa was living in human form on this earth, there were no rains. At that time the cowherdesses began to pray to the Lord. One form of prayer was the celebration of *mārgaḻi nōṉbu* by the unmarried girls. Early in the morning these girls went to the river Yamunā, took their bath, and prayed. They also wished to have Kṛṣṇa Himself as their husband.

A more or less similar version of the story is found in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. From this it would appear that this *nōṉbu* went by the name of *Kātyāyanī vrata* for these girls are said to worship the goddess Kātyāyanī who would help them in securing Kṛṣṇa as their husband. The *pūja* lasted for a month and on the last day, the Lord appeared before them and after a rigid test agreed to fulfil their wishes.[1] We know even to-day the orthodox Brahmanas performing what is known as the *dhanurmāsa pūja*. They get up very early in the morning, bathe in the river, and offer worship. *Dhanurmāsa* is the Sanskrit for *Mārgaḻi*. Worship is also offered in all temples before sunrise in that month.

This religious observance is not unknown to the Śaṅgam literature. It is known as *Tain-nīrāṭal* literally 'bath in the month of Tai'.[2] Why this came to be known as *tain-nīrāṭal* is thus explained.[3] The festival was perhaps begun on the full moon day of *Mārgaḻi* and then continued for a month up to the full

[1] *Daśamaskanda*, ch. 22.

[2] See the *Paripāḍal* தைந்நீராடுதல் (st. 11, l. 17). See also *Kalittogai*, 59, 80; *Ainguṟu*, 84 and *Naṟṟiṇai*, 22.

[3] See M. Rāghava Ayyangar's article in Tamil on *Tainnīrāṭal* in vol. 4, No. 12 of the *Harisamaya Divākaram*, esp. pp. 276-7.

moon day of the *Puṣya*. According to the calculation of the *pūrṇimānta* system the month of *mārgaḻi* after the fifteenth day is considered as *tai*.

Nallanduvaṉār, the author of the *Paripāḍal* in question, designates this festival as *ambāvāṭal*.[1] According to this authority, the festival commenced with the *Tiruvādirai* day of the month of *mārgaḻi*. In his days the Vēdic Brahmanas were engaged in the *agnihotra* rites when the girls after their bath in the *Vaigai* also worshipped the fire-god in order that seasonal rains might visit the land and they might secure good husbands. It is believed that the present festival of *Ārudra Darśanam* or *Tiruvādirai* celebrated in the month of *mārgaḻi* in the Tamil and Malayalam districts is a relic of this ancient practice of *Pāvai nōṉbu*. In those days it was a vow observed by unmarried girls, the observance of which commenced with the beginning of *mārgaḻi* month and came to an end on the full moon day of that month. This practice of religious austerity was sacred to the goddess Kātyāyanī. It was a belief then that by the grace of Kātyāyanī the young girls could get suitable husbands for themselves so that their lives could be peaceful and happy. What is remarkable is that it is being observed every year both by the followers of the Vaiṣṇava and the Śaiva cult.

Spring Festival—Kāma Nōṉbu.—Allied to the above vowed observance was another vow in practice, known as *Kāma nōṉbu* observed religiously by the unmarried girls of the Tamil land. In an ancient work on grammar *Paṉṉirupāṭṭiyal*,[2] there is a reference to this religious practice. It was generally observed by girls aged twelve. The object of worship was Kāmadēva, the God of love. The aim of worship was to secure loving

[1] St. 11. [2] யாண்டு ஈராறதில் எழிற்காம னோன்பொடு (182).

and proper partners in life so as to ensure full material enjoyments. It would appear that this observance lasted for two full months commencing with the month of *tai*. That this ancient religious practice continued to exist for a long time is evident from references to it in the later works *Jīvakacintāmaṇi*, *Peruṅkatai* and *Nācciyār Tirumoḻi*. In the *Cintāmaṇi* which is generally assigned to the eighth or the ninth century A.D., it is said that one Suramañjari observed this vow in order to secure Jīvaka, the hero of the story, as her husband.[1] Again we have the evidence of *Peruṅkatai*, probably a work of the same date, where Padmāvati's vowed observance of Kāmadēva is mentioned in order to secure Udayaṉa as her loving partner.[2] There are again the soul-stirring stanzas of the *Nācciyār Tirumoḻi* where Āṇḍāḷ engages herself in offering prayers to the god of love to help her to wed the Lord enshrined in Śrīraṅga.[3] These instances go to demonstrate the popularity of such *vratas* and how they were solemnly observed in a true religious spirit.

Superstitious Belief in Astrology.—In the age of Tolkāppiyaṉār and perhaps much earlier, the ancient Tamils were superstitious, god-fearing, and prone to believe things readily. It was an age of crude astrology for this science was a later growth in the South Indian tree. Astrological calculations were curious and possibly peculiar to the simple and unostentatious life of these ancient peoples. The aid of astrology was sought whenever any one fell ill and the sickness was persistent. It was also pressed into service when calamities of any sort, providential or otherwise, threatened the country or were expected. The

[1] 2057. [2] iii. 5, 27-33.
[3] See *Āḻvārkaḷ Kālanilai*, pp. 77-9.

astrologers, it is interesting to note, belonged to the class of the mountain tribe, known as Kuṛavar and what is more remarkable is that it was largely the Kuṛava women who adopted fortune-telling as their profession. The term[1] *Kuṛamakaḷ kuṛi eyiṉi* occurring in the Saṅgam works like the *Naṛṛiṇai* (357) and the *Puṛam* (157) shows that these Kuṛava women alone were engaged in this fortune-telling practice. That the male members also took to this profession is evident from the *Aiṅguṛunūṛu* (394).[2] The relic of this very ancient custom is still preserved by the class of *narik-kuṛattis* and *Kuḍukuḍuppāṇḍis* who go about begging from door to door in every village and town predicting good or evil for every member of the family.

There were two modes of arriving at a solution. It was either by what is known as *kaṭṭu*[3] or *kaḻaṅgu*.[4] The method of *kaṭṭu* consisted in taking a handful of paddy grains at random and counting it by twos to arrive at a decision favourable or unfavourable. She who did this was known as *kaṭṭuvicci*.[5] This practice of predicting fortune by means of paddy grains finds mention in the works of Māṇikkavāśakar and Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. In the epoch of the *Tirukkōvai* (285), it was one of the accepted ways of thought-reading. By the counting of paddy one would be able to give out what the other had in his mind.[6] Again Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār refers to the practice of seeking the advice of a *kaṭṭuvicci* by the

[1] குறமகள்-குறி எயினி. [2] குறமகளீன்ற குறியிறைப் புதல்வரொடு

[3] கட்டு. [4] கழங்கு.

கட்டினுங் கழங்கினும் வெறியென இருவரும்

ஒட்டிய திறத்தாற் செய்திக் கண்ணும் *Tol. Poruḷ Sūtra* Quoted in *Poruḷadikāra āraicci*, p. 63.

[5] கட்டுவிச்சி [6] விறற்சேய்கடவும்.

மயிலிதன் றேகொடி வாரணங் காண்கவண் சூர்தடிந்த

அயிலிதன் றேயிதன் றேநெல்லிற் றோன்று மவன்வடிவே.

relatives of a girl who was ailing from love sickness for Tirumāl.[1] Reference is also made to this custom in a later work entitled *Mīnākṣiyammai Kuṟam* by Kumaraguruparа Muṉivar.

The other mode of divination was with the help of the molucca beans. Fortune-telling from molucca beans by the Vēlaṉ is as much an ancient custom as the counting of paddy for the same purpose. About the exact method adopted we have no authentic material. All that we know is that it was done by Vēlaṉ the priest offering worship to Murugaṉ. The Vēlaṉ acted as the oracle and gave out what would happen and what would not happen. There are two ways of Vēlaṉ telling the fortune or misfortune. One was *veriyāṭal* and the other was the choice of a root. Yet another method of appeasing the wrath of the deity was to draw a figure[2] just like the diseased person and make a present of it to the temple.[3]

The Vēlaṉ method of fortune-telling is current even to-day in Malabar and in Cochin.[4] These persons are generally known as *Mantravādins* and four kinds of Vēlaṉ are distinguished: Bharatavēlaṉ, Vāgai Vēlaṉ, Pāṉavēlaṉ, and Maṉṉavēlaṉ. These resort to different practices by which they are said to effect sure cures for incurable diseases.

Indra's festival.—Ancient Tamil *Nāḍu* celebrated many a festival which have become extinct in course of time. Among such festivals two can be prominently mentioned. One is the festival of Balarāma. The other is the festival sacred to Indra. According to the

1 See *Śiriya Tirumaḍal*, ll. 20-23.

2 படிமம். 3 See *Aiṅguṟu*, 245.

4 See *Castes and Tribes of South India* under the heading 'Vēlaṉ.' Also *Porutladikāra ārāycci*, p. 66.

Tamils, Indra is the God of the *marudam* region, and according to the Sanskritists, he is the lord of heaven. The inhabitants of the *marudam* region generally celebrated this festival which lasted for twenty-eight days. It was a form of prayer to remove one's difficulties and dangers. This festival is prominently mentioned in the twin epics, the *Śilappadikāram*[1] and the *Maṇimēkalai*.

It was usually an annual function. The *vajrāyudha* was the symbolical representation of the God Indra. On the eve of the commencing day of the festival, the citizens were told by tom-tom to adorn and beautify the city. The old dirty sand was removed from the streets and fresh sand was strewn. Over the temple flew aloft high in the air the auspicious flag. The entrance of every house was adorned with choice decorations. On this occasion all the officers of the state paid visits to the king and expressed good wishes to him and to his land. The chief feature of this function was the bathing of the deity Indra in the sacred waters of the Kāviri.. Again during this period, fire oblations were offered in the other temples of Śiva, Viṣṇu, Balarāma, etc. In the temple halls of even heretical sects, there were lectures on *dharma* and expounding of the *Purāṇas*.[2] There were also musical performances. The end of the festival was marked by the citizens taking a sea-bath with the members of their family.[3]

Though it is claimed that this Indra was a Tamil deity and has nothing to do with the Indra of Sanskrit literature,[4] still a comparative study of Tamil and Sanskrit literature tempts us to identify the festival with that

[1] Kādai, v. [2] *Ibid.*, ll. 179-81.

[3] கடலாடுதல்.

[4] See *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture*, pp. 27-9.

of the *Indradhvaja* well known to the Purāṇic and epic literature. The *Viṣṇudharmōttara Purāṇa*[1] gives the legendary origin of this festival. In one of the wars between the dēvas and asurās, the latter fled terrified at the sight of Indra's banner. Then Indra worshipped it and handed it over to king Vasu. According to the *Dēvīpurāṇa,* Indra gave it to Sōma and the latter in turn to Dakṣa. Pleased with the latter's worship Indra said that the king who would institute a festival in honour of this *dhvaja* would ever be prosperous and victorious. A special log of wood was to be cut and planted on the eastern side of the town. Elaborate rules are laid down for selecting the tree to be used. The piece of wood thus cut down was taken in procession to the city which was decorated magnificently for this very purpose. The festival came in Bhādrapada śuklāṣṭamī[2] when the *dhvaja* was taken to the city. For four days prayers were offered, and on the last day was performed the ceremony of bathing. The period of the festival covered a fortnight.

From this it would appear that Indra's festival was once celebrated also in North India and that it fell into desuetude in course of time. At least we have no evidence of its celebration after the commencement of the Christian era.

Conclusion.—It is no easy task to compress the several aims and features of the social organization and of the social life of the ancient Tamils even in a general

[1] Quoted in the *Viramitrōdaya,* pp. 425-33.

[2] The *Dēvīpurāṇa* furnishes alternative dates Prōṣṭapada Śuklāṣṭami which is the same as the bhādrapada roughly October and āśvina-Śuklāṣṭami. (See *Viramitrōdaya,* pp. 421-5.) It is interesting to see that the *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions the latter date which is roughly the month of November, thus corroborating the account in the *Dēvīpurāṇa.* (See *Kiṣkindha,* ch. 16, 35 and 38.)

survey like the one I have attempted in the above pages. The field is vast, and the most conspicuous aspects to be dealt with are many and varied. I have tried to give a picture of the chief features of Tamil social life, at least such of those pleasing aspects which would afford rich food for thought to the antiquarian. Notwithstanding their intimate and close contact with Sanskrit culture, the ancient Tamils continued to live the simple rural life pursuing their own customs, occupations and superstitious beliefs. Though towns were few and far between, fashionable people lived in cities, and enjoyed a life of ease and pleasure. Apparently the influence of Sanskrit culture was felt greatly in towns and cities and introduced into the simple life and organization of the Tamils, a complex type of a system of social polity which sought not to undermine the distinct features of the extant culture still fresh and pure, but to stimulate and elevate it to nobler achievements in the realms especially of arts, crafts and letters.

APPENDIX

ADDITIONAL NOTES

Page 3, line 3.

There is a reference to Perumbaṟṟappuḷiyūr Nambi in an inscription, dated in the 36th regnal year of Māṟavarman Kulaśēkara Pāṇḍyan, found in the temple of Tiruppattūr, Ramnad District. It mentions a grant of land made to Nambi by temple priests. Māṟavarman Kulaśekara Pāṇḍyan was anointed king in A.D. 1268, and as the inscription is dated in his 36th regnal year, Nambi should have flourished towards the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century (See M.E.R. No. 133 of 1908).

Page 5, line 5.

In the commentary of the Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ, there are several stanzas quoted from a certain Kōvai celebrating the victorious deeds of a certain Pāṇḍya. What this Kōvai was and who this Pāṇḍya was, have been recently brought to light. Pāṇḍit M. Raghava Ayyangar, conjectured on the strength of *Kaḷaviyaṟ-kārikai,* now edited by Mr. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, that the Kōvai under reference was *Pāṇḍikkōvai* and the king celebrated was Neḍumāṟan, victor at Nelvēli. (See *Āḻvār-Kālanilai,* p. 55, note (II ed.) Madras, 1931; *Kaḷaviyaṟ-Kārikai* with commentary 1931, Madras). This lends support to fix the date of the composition of the *Pāṇḍikkōvai* in the 7th century A.D. It then follows that the commentary of the Iṟaiyaṉār Ahapporuḷ should be assigned at best to the eighth century A.D.

Page 13, Note 1.

1. Though the antiquity of the *Tolkāppiyam* has been generally accepted by scholars, yet an attempt has been made in a recent publication to assign it to a much later period. (*The Chronology of the Early Tamils* by K. N. Sivaraja Pillai (1932) Appendix xv). But we see no reason to revise the view expressed in this book. As against the argument of the mention of *hōra* in *Tolkāppiyam,* a reference may be made to Mr. K. G. Sesha Ayyar's contribution to the *Madras Christian College Magazine,* October 1917, pp. 177-9. In addition to the arguments advanced in favour of the *Tolkāppiyam*

the mention and use of *yuktis* in the *Tolkāppiyam* may be pointed out. It is a scheme in outline on which the construction of a treatise is based. Kauṭalya (4th century B.C.) furnishes thirty-two principles of the *Tantrayukti*. Only a few authors such as Vātsyāyana, Suśruta and Caraka are familiar with such principles of exposition. While Caraka mentions thirty-five principles, Tolkāppiyaṉār enumerates thirty-two and almost follows Kauṭalya. Therefore Tolkāppiyaṉār flourished much anterior to Caraka and belonged to the same age as that of Kauṭalya. (See my article in *J.O.R.* 1930, pp. 82, ff.)

Page 20, Line 3.

For a fuller discussion of the Indus culture see my article on the culture of the Indus Valley in the *Journal of the Madras University,* 1933.

Page 24, Line 1.

The word Dramiḍa Saṅghātākṣara is found in a sūtra in the Malayalam Grammar *Līlātilakam* written in Sanskrit. It means the letters of the Draviḍa Sanghāta as distinct from Sanskrit. According to this sūtra *Pāṭṭu* is written in Dramiḍa Sanghātākṣara and has *edukai* and *mōnai.* (Mr. T. K. Joseph, Trivandrum drew my attention to this). For the Draviḍa sangha among the Jains see S.I.I., VII, No. 441, p. 277.)

Page 26, Note 1.

A new edition of the *Poruḷadikāram* has been published by Mr. S. Kanakasabapati Pillai with commentaries of Naccinārkiṉiyar and Pērāśiriyar (Madras 1934 and 1935).

Note 2.

Cintāmaṇi or Jīvakacintāmaṇi has been published by Mm. Dr. V. Swaminatha Ayyar.

Valayāpati and Kuṇḍalakēśi are still lost to us. But stray stanzas quoted in Puṛattiraṭṭu now in mss. from these two works are published in *Śen Tamiḻ,* Vol. I and also in *Peruntokai* (1936).

Page 27, Note 4.

There is another edition of *Kuṛuntogai* by Vidvān Arunachala Desikar.

Page 30 (6).

The *Kalittogai* has been recently published by Paṇḍit E. V. Anantarama Ayyar in three volumes 1931 with copious notes,

and a valuable index. A reference on page 962 of the third volume to the concluding lines of the commentator clearly indicates that Nallānduvaṉār who was the author of the fifth *Kali* was also the compiler of the whole book.

Page 30, (7).

There is a new edition of the *Ahanāṉūṟu* by the same editor (1933) Madras. It is to be regretted that there is no index to this edition.

Page 31, Note 2.

A revised edition of the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* has been published by the same author.

Section X.

An excellent and revised edition of *Pattuppāṭṭu* with the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar has been published by Mm. Dr. V. Swaminatha Ayyar, (Third edition) 1931.

Page 33 (3) ll. 3-4.

Iḍaikkaḻināḍu exists to-day as a little nāḍu in the south-west of Madras on the sea coast and bears the same name. Here still exists a small village named Nallūr (Third edition of *Pattuppāṭṭu* p. 29).

Page 34, line 1.

Ōymā nāḍu was between Palar and Pennar in the South Arcot and Chingleput districts. Kiḍaṅgil (*śiṟupāṇ*) l. 160 identified with modern Tindivanam formed an important town in Ōymā-nāḍu. (M. E. R., No. 143 of 1900) S.I.I., VII., p. 64.

Line 10.

We have to distinguish Vellore and other cities from the modern town of Vellore. The cities mentioned in the *Śiṟupāṇāṟṟu-ppaḍai* were in the territorial division of the Ōymā nāḍu in South Arcot district.

Page 35, line 8.

This Neḍuñjeḻiyan is celebrated as a relentless warrior in *Aham* 36, where his conquest of seven kings is given prominence. See also 175 and 209. *Puṟam* (17) refers to his relations with Yāṉaikkaṭcēy-māndaram-cēral-Irumporai. (See also st. 236)

That he was himself a poet is seen from the verse 72. Talaiyālaṅgāṉam or Talaiyālaṅkāḍu has a Śiva shrine and here Neḍuñjeḻiyan is said to have conquered seven kings.

Ibid. (7).

This ancient Tamil idyll *Neḍunalvāḍai* has been translated into English by J. M. Somasundaram in the *Journal of Indian History* Vol. XIII, 1934, pp. 126-131. In a prefatory note Dr. S. K. Ayyangar, the Editor of the Journal refers to the different achievements of Neḍuñjeḻiyan as can be gathered from the larger Śiṉṉamanūr plates and concludes that the period of rule of this Pāṇḍyan must be sometime in the 3rd century A.D. (*Ibid.*, pp. 123-5).

Page 36 (10) l. 3.

Peruṅkuṉṟūr is in Iraṇiya muṭṭa nāḍu (M.E.R., No. 290 of 1929-30). In No. 276 and 282 of 1929-30 Kīḻ Iraṇiyamuṭṭam and Mēl Iraṇiyamuṭṭam are distinguished. Kīḻ Iraṇiyamuṭṭam is said to be Aḻagar malai, and the region round about the Aḻagar malai in Madura district should have formed Iraṇiya muṭṭa nāḍu in the epoch of the Śaṅgam.

Ibid. l. 4.

Naṉṉaṉ referred to here is the Vēḷir chieftain of Śeṅkaṇma now called Śeṅgama lying to the west of Tiruvannamalai in Palkuṉṟakkōṭṭam of which Tiruvēṅgaḍam (modern Tirupati) formed a part. (*Aham* 97). He is probably different from Naṉṉaṉ of Ēḻil hill (Saptaśaila) near Cannanore in Malabar District (see *Aham* 152).

Naviram hill now known as Triśūlagiri or Parvatamālai in the Tiruvannamalai Taluq, North Arcot District. Reference is made to this hill in an epigraph (S.I.I., Vol. VII, p. 49).

Page 39. Note 4.

There is also, an edition by Paṇḍit E. V. Anantarama Aiyar with an ancient commentary and his own notes, (Madras, 1931).

line 22.

Pandit M. Raghava Aiyangar is inclined to identify Poyhai Āḻvār with Poyhaiyār on the strength of *Yāpparuṅgalavirutti*. (see *Āḻvar Kālanilai* pp. 23 ff. (II ed.). Professor K. A. Nilakanta-Sastri has accepted this identification, (see *The Cōḻas*, I. pp. 64-66).

Page 40. (*4*).

11. 2-3.

Kainilai is published with commentary by Paṇḍit E. V. Anantarama Aiyar, (Madras).

Page 41. Note 1.

Kārnāṟpadu edited by K. Ramaswami Pillai with commentary and notes. There is a learned introduction to this edition. (Kāḷayukti year—Madras).

(*9*)

Aintiṇai—first edited by R. Raghava Aiyangar in *Śen Tamiḻ* Vol. I. Another edition is by Mr. S. Somasundara Desikar (1918).

Page 42.

(*11*)

Aintiṇaieḻupadu first edited by R. Raghava Aiyangar *Śen Tamiḻ* Vol. IV. Another edition by S. Somasundara Desikar (1926).

(*12*)

Tiṇaimālai-nuṟṟaimpadu has been published by the Madura Tamil Śangam (1904), *Śen Tamiḻ series*, 8.

(*13*)

Tirikaḍugam edited by Arumuganavalar with the commentary of Tirukkōṭṭiyur Rāmānujachariar. (Madras) Fourth edition.

(*14*)

Ēlādi edited with commentary, (Ripon Press, Madras) 1924.

(*15*)

Ācārak-Kōvai edited with commentary published by R. Paramasivam Pillai of Tinnevelly.

Page 44.

Mudumoḻikkānci-published by the Ripon Press, Madras (1910).

Page 45. Note (*1*).

See also *Śila.* canto. xxv 1, 132.

Page 47. Note (1).

In commenting on the term Vēḷāp--pārppāṉ, the commentator says a *laukika-brahmana* who would not engage himself in Vēdic sacrifices. He is called ūrppārppān. Their occupation was manufacture of bangles from conches. That Nakkīrar belonged to this community of Brahmans is attested to by the *Tiruviḷaiyāḍal* of Nambi (16).

அங்கங் குலுங்க வரிவாளி னெய்யென்றோர்
பங்கக் கவிதை பாமன் சொலவிளிந்து
சங்கறுப்ப தெங்கள்குலந் தம்பிராற் கேதென்றோர்
தங்க முறுங்கவிதை சொன்னா னெதிர்துணிந்து (st. 22)

It is said that there is an image of Nakkīrar and a temple dedicated to him in the West Masi Street, Madura. There is another image in the temple of Tirupparaṅguṉṟam.

Page 50, ll. 27-28.

This incident is referred to by Appar in the Tiruppattūr *patigam* as

நன்பாட்டுப் புலவனாய்ச் சங்கமேறி
நற்கனகக் கிழிதருமிக் கருளினோன் காண் (*Tēvāram*)

cp. *Kallāḍam*

பொதியப்பொருப்பன்..............பெருமான்.

Sen Tamiḻ VI. p. 56.

Page 53.

Kapilar—a study in Tamil by V. Venkatarajulu Reddiyar published by the University of Madras (1936). He examines in *note* 3 of pp. 20-21 the theories regarding the marriage of the two daughters of Pāri and believes that Kapilar gave both daughters to Malayan laying stress on பாரிதன் அடைக்கலம் before பெண்ணை He thus rejects the account given in the *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam.*

Page 58. Note 4.

The light thrown on the subject of the marriage of the daughters of Pāri by the Tirukkōyilūr Inscription dispels once for all the gloom that enveloped it. From colophons to *Puṟam* 236 and 113 we gather that Kapilar placed these princesses under safe custody. But what he did afterwards we could not say from literature. Here Epigraphy comes quite handy. A critical study

of the inscription under reference indicates that after placing these princesses under safe custody, Kapilar called on the Cēra king Śelvakkaḍuṅgō and received from him gifts of land and gold. To venture a conjecture, with this gift with which he returned to Tirukkōyilūr he was able to effect the marriage of one daughter who was given to the chieftain Malayan. There is a view that both daughters were married at the same time in spite of the expression பெண்ணை in the singular. Whatever this may be, Kapilar then bestowed his thoughts on attaining heaven and on the strength of the inscription we can safely say that he died at Tirukkōyilūr itself. If we accept the theory that Kapilar effected the marriage of only one daughter, then the tradition recorded in the *Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam* fills up the gap. The other daughter's marriage was effected by Avvaiyār.

Page 59. 11. 1-3.

If we are to reconcile the statements in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* of வடக்கிருந்த கபிலர் with that in the inscription கனல்புகும் கபிலர், we have to infer that *vaḍakkiruttal* was of different kinds. One was by fasting, the second by falling into fire, and so on.

Page 61. Note 1.

The capital of this king Adigamāṉ Añji was Tagaḍūr the modern Dharmapuri in Salem District. Some scholars opine that it was in Mysore state. It seems to have been an important place in early South Indian History. This Adigamāṉ belonged to the line of the Cēra kings and was probably a chieftain independent of the Cēra king reigning at Karūr. He was a contemporary of Cēramāṉ Perumcēral Irumpoṟai with whom he came into conflict in which he was killed. The Añji line continued however to rule after him in the same place (Tagaḍūr) as is evident from several old inscriptions. Subsequent to the Cēra epoch and till about A.D. 931 it formed the capital of the Nolambas. (See *Ins. of Mad. Presidency* p. 1211). It is interesting to note from the *Puṟam* (392) ll. 20-21 and (99) l. 2 that an ancestor of this Adigamāṉ introduced the cultivation of sugar-cane for the first time in the Tamil land.

Page 64. Note 5.

A recent writer examines the relevant texts from the linguistic point and takes the view that this Paraṇadēvaṉar could not be the Śaṅgam poet Paraṇar. See *Paraṇar*—in Tamil by Paṇḍit Venkata-

rajulu Reddiyar pp. 60-64, published by the University of Madras (1933).

Page 65. Line 6.

Avvaiyār is still worshipped in a rock cut shrine in Adiganūr in South Travancore.

Page 65. Note 4.

A revised edition has been published (1932) by C. Coomarasami Naidu & Sons, Madras.

Page 68, l. 11.

The term Eḻiṉi is interesting. The Adigamāṉ line of kings beginning with Pokuṭṭeḻiṉi seems to have adopted the title Eḻiṉi. This is evident from a reference in one epigraph of the thirteenth century. Here it occurs *வஞ்சியர் குலபதி எழினி.* This shows that for centuries together the epithet Eḻiṉi was adopted and it also indicates that that line was a branch of the ancient Cēra dynasty. *S.I.I., Vol. I, No.* 75, p. 106.

Page 71, Note 1.

Tradition attributes the *Padikam* to Iḷaṅgō, and it is rather difficult to set aside the traditional evidence in this particular.

Page 75. 1, 13.

In *Naṟṟiṇai* st. 216 by Madurai Marudaṉ Iḷanāgaṉār the story of Kaṇṇaki after her husband's death is referred to. From this we can easily judge that the story contained in the *Śilappadikāram* was current even in the Śaṅgam period. The poet calls Kaṇṇaki *orumulai aṟutta tirumāvuṇṇi.* It is mentioned here that Kaṇṇaki stood in a loft under the *vēngai* tree. This is additional proof to show that *Iḷaṅgō-Aḍigaḷ* belonged to the Śaṅgam age.

Page 79, Sec. VI, ll. 3-4.

Maduraikkūlavāṇikaṉ Śīttalaiccāttaṉār is mentioned in colophons to *Ahanāṉūṟu* 229, 306 and 320 and *Puṟaṉāṉūṟu* 59. Madurai Śīttalaiccāttaṉ occurs in *Kuṟuntogai*, 154. Kūlavāṇikaṉ śāttaṉ occurs in the *Śilappadikāram* and *Maṇimēkalai.* From this it would appear that Śāttaṉ belonged to Madura and he bore the epithets śīttalai and kūlavāṇikaṉ. Some are of opinion that Śīttalai was the name of his native village but there is reliable

evidence to show that he was known by this title after his diseased head. (See for *e.g., Tiruvalluvamālai*). The *sūtra* 174 (Tolk. Soll) சினைமுதற் பெயர் is commented by *Sēnāvaraiyar* "part being attribute of a whole". This is what is called *avaya-avayavi bhāvam.* It cannot be doubted that one and the same Sāttan is under reference throughout. (For more details see intro. to *Puranānūru* by Dr. V. Swaminatha Aiyar pp. 50-51).

Page 81, Line 1.

There has been an edition of the *Manimēkalai* before Paṇḍit Swaminatha Aiyar published his scholarly edition with commentary and notes.

Page 88, Sec. II.

Śaiva Mystics: See in this connection the learned introduction by Prof. F. Kingsbury and G. E. Phillips to their book entitled *'Hymns of the Tamil Saivite Saints'* in the Heritage of India Series.

Page 92, l. 18.

The date of Sambandar has been again reopened by Paṇḍit M. Raghava Aiyangar in an article contributed to *Dr. S. K. Aiyangar Comm. Volume* (Madras, 1936) under caption 'Contemporaneity of Saints Jñāna Sambandar and Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār.' It is argued that there was a second invasion of Vātāpi and that it took place about 675 A.D. in the reign of Paramēśvaravarman I, son of Narasimha varman I. It is further argued that Neḍumāṛan the victor of Nelvēli who was converted by Sambanda to Śaivism could not have come to the throne before A.D. 670. As Sambanda was a contemporary of Neḍumāṛan he could not have been a contemporary of Narasimhavarman I whose reign came to an end, it is presumed, before Neḍumāṛan came to the Pāṇḍyan throne. It is thus made out that Sambandar should have flourished from Circa 670 A.D. to 686, that is, the latter half of the seventh century.

Page 97.

The date of Sundaramūrti:—In his *Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India* (Madras University, 1936), Mr. C. V. Narayana Aiyar devotes nearly 33 pages to establish his thesis, viz., that Sundaramūrti lived after Māṇikkavāśakar. He assigns

Māṇikkavāśakar to the period between A.D. 660-692 thereby making him a contemporary of Arikēśari, the victor of Nelvēli and his son Kōccaḍaiyan Raṇadhīra (see pp. 398-431). The date of these saints is always a disputed question, and nothing can be indicated conclusively. At present the generally accepted theory that prevails is that Māṇikkavāśakar came after Sundarar.

Page 99. Note 5.

In the course of a conversation Mahāvidvan R. Raghava Aiyangar of the Annamalai University drew my attention to the following lines of the *Tiruvāśagam* which are an unmistakable reference to Sundaramūrti :

பரம்கருணையோடு எதிர்ந்து தோற்றி மெய்யடியார்க்கு
அருட்துறை அளிக்கும் சோதியை.

In the light of this, it is difficult to maintain that Sundarar lived after Māṇikkavāśakar.

Page 101, Note 1.

See again *Māṇikkavāśakar Purāṇam* by Pandit V. Ganapati Pillai—published (1933) by C.V. Jambulingam Pillai, Mylapore, Madras.

Page 103, Sec. III, l. 8.

'The name 'Āḻvār' has a peculiar significance of its own. It means one who has sunk into the depths of his existence or one who is lost in a rapturous devotion to the Lord. It is a word quite descriptive of all God-intoxicated men.' So write R.S. Desikan and B.L. Ranganathan in their introduction to the book entitled *Grains of Gold*—Madras (1934). See also section VI on the *Āḻvārs, Ibid.* pp. 62-68. See again the introduction to *Hymns of the Āḻvārs* by J.S.M. Hooper (Heritage of India series.)

Page 105, Line 17.

It is generally said that the *Tiruvāymoḻi* contains a thousand verses, though the actual number of the verses are more than that number.

Page 114, Para. 2, Line 11 and Note. 3.

The reference is to Nācciyār Tirumoḻi.

Page 119, last para.

The date of Tirumūlar which has been discussed by V.V. Ramana Sastri in his introduction to Mr. M.V. Viswanatha Pillai's edition of the *Tirumantiram* (Madras, 1912) has been further examined by Mr. C. V. Narayana Aiyar. On the authority of the stanza 1646 appearing in the VI Tantra wherein occurs the expression தமிழ்மண்டல மைந்தும் (five Tamil maṇḍalas), and interpreting them to be the Pāṇḍya, Cōḻa, Cēra, Toṇḍai and Koṅgu provinces, and assuming that the Koṅgu maṇḍalam came into prominence in the fourth century A.D., the fourth century is fixed as the lower limit, and the sixth century as the upper limit as the date of Tirumūlar. This is inferred from his reference to temples of the sixth century and earlier. (*op. cit.* pp. 206-224).

Page 122, Sec. III, line 5.

Vappuḷiyūr near the modern town Cidambaram.

Page 123, line 7.

Vaḍalūr very near the modern town Cidambaram.

Page 123, 11, 25-26.

There is a new biography in English by Mr. T. V. Govindarajulu Chetti, Bangalore, containing copious footnotes, appendices, and quotations from *Tiru-Aruṭpā*. See also *Tiru-Aruṭpā* (அடக்க விலை பதிப்பு) (I-IV parts) by A. Balakrishna Pillai, Madras, (1931-32).

Page 131, Footnote 1.

That Vaḷḷuvar is a variant of Vallabha has been confirmed by similar expressions in epigraphy. In South Indian Inscriptions we have the expression Rājaśēkhara Vaḷḷuva இராஜசேகரரான வள்ளு வரும் கூடிச்செய்த கச்சம், S.I.I., Vol. V, No. 75). In the Annual Report for Epigraphy we have Pāṇḍyan Ṣri Vallluva பாண்டியன் ஸ்ரீவல்லுவன் (M.E.R., No.. 46 of 1907). Thus Vallabar, Vaḷḷuvar are variants. There is also the occurrence of the name of a Cēra commander by name Ñāñcil Vaḷḷuvan. (*Puṟam, st.* 137-140). The Rājas of Vaḷḷuvanāḍ in Malabar district go by the name of Vallabhas (see Logan, *Malabar* Vol. I, P. 262.) In the light of this explanation and in the face of the authority of *Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai* (4 and 28) where Vaḷḷuvar is said to be an incarnation of Brahmā it can be taken as settled that he was

a member of the Brahmana community, (See also M. Raghava Aiyangar's introduction to the edition of *Tirukkuṟaḷ* ed. by A. Aranganatha Mudaliar, Triplicane, Madras, 1933).

Page 132, Sec. III.

The Age of Tiruvaḷḷuvar. See also Intro. pp. 3-9 in his book *The Sacred Kuṟaḷ* by H. A. Popley, (Heritage of India series 1931).

Page 136, para 2.

The Jain tradition says that Vaḷḷuvar was a pupil of Ēlācārya (M.S.R. Aiyangar—*Studies in South Indian Jainism* pp. 42-4). According to inscriptions this ācārya belonged to the village Hēmagrāma (பொன்னூர்) To its northwest lay the Nilgiris (not the Nilgiris of W. Ghats) where he is said to have performed penance. As he belonged to the sixth century A.D. (M.E.R., 1928-29 pp. 88-89) and Vaḷḷuvar belonged to the early centuries before the Christian Era, it is difficult to accept the Jaina tradition. See also pp. 5-6 *Nīlakēśi* ed. by Prof. A. Chakravarti, Madras, 1936.

Page 150, Note 3.

For a detailed study of the Kuṟaḷ polity see Prof. C. S. Srinivasacharya's article—*Some Political Ideas in the Kuṟaḷ* in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. IX, pp. 244 ff. See also Dr. S. K. Ayyangar's *Evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions in S. India*, pp. 56 ff.

Page, 176, Note 1.

There is a recent edition of the *Tirukuṟaḷ* with Maṇakkuḍavar's commentary, (edited by K. Vadivelu Chettiar, Madras 1925). The other available commentaries are unpublished. We have referred in the text to the commentator Parimēlaḻagar who, tradition says belonged to the city of Kāñci. The other commentators of the *Kuṟaḷ* were nine. These are Darumar, Maṇakkuḍavar, Tānattar Naccar, Paruti, Tirumalaiyar, Mallar, Pārippērumāḷ, and Kāliṅgar, (see *Peruntokai* (Madura Saṅgam ed. 1936) st. 1538.)

Page 181, ll. 2-3.

See in this connection the contribution entitled *Society and Religion in the Age of the Tolkāppiyam* by Vidvan R. Viswanatha in the *Dr. S. K. Aiyangar Comm. Volume*, pp. 274 and ff. On the Age of *Tolkāppiyam* from the linguistic point of view, se

Dr. P. S. S. Sastri's article 'Some Landmarks in Tamil Linguistic History, *Ibid.* pp. 348-51, op. *The Ancient Tamils* Part I, published by S. K. Pillai, Madras, 1934.

Page 207, Note 6.

More details on this and other allied topics are furnished in the Introduction to my forthcoming book *Śilappadikāram* published by the Oxford University Press.

Page 211, Note 1.

cp. *Vāsiṣṭha Dharmaśāstra* (III, 13-14). 'If anybody finds treasure, the king shall take it giving one sixth to the finder', and 'if a Brahmana following the six lawful occupations finds it, the king shall not take it.' S.B.E., XIV, p. 18. See also *Gautama,* X, 43-45.

Page 213, Note 4.

In the Cōḻa inscriptions it is said that the *brahmadēyas* represented purely Brahmana villages which usually had names ending with Caturvēdimaṅgalam. See p. 77, *Studies in Cōḻa History and Administration* by K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, (Madras University, 1932). See also Dr. A. Appadorai: *Economic Conditions of South India,* Vol. I, p. 140. (Madras University, 1936).

Page 219, l. 19.

Nonpayment of kist was regarded also as an offence, (see *Puṟam* 35, and the *Colophon.*

Page 225, 1, 6.

Kuṟi and *Perumguṟi* occurring in inscriptions have been generally taken to mean village assemblies. See the *Tamil Lexicon.* A critical examination of the terms and the circumstances under which they are mentioned in certain inscriptions makes us doubt whether they can bear that interpretation.

Page 242, Sec. VII, Line 4.

Prayer for the victory of their king Neḍuñjeḻiyaṉ by the maids of his queen. See *Neḍunalvāḍai.*

Page 254, Sec. XII, 11, 2, 4.

For a graphic description of the actual contest in battlefield in very early times, see *Perumtogai,* 532, quoted from *Tolk.* Nacc. Commentary.

Page 268, l. 10.

For the great importance attached to irrigation and irrigational facilities see *Puṟam* 18.

Page 295, l. 23.

Kathakaḷi is perhaps a development from Śākkiyar Kūttu referred to in the *Śilappadikāram.* A Tamil inscription, No. 65 of 1914 of the time of Rājēndra Cōḻadēva I records gift of land to Śākkai Māṟāyan Vikramaśōḻan for performing the dance (śākkai) thrice on each of the festivals: Mārgaḻi-Tiruvāḏurai and Vaigāśi-tiruvādirai, cp., No. 250 of 1926. Śākkaik-kūttu is called Āryak-kūttu. An Āryak-kūttu with six acts was played by Kumaran Śrīkaṇṭan for which he got the Nṛtyabhōga called Śākkaikkāni in the presence of the god at Tiruvāvaduturai, during the 18th year of Rājēndra Cōḻa I. (No. 120 of 1925). The Āryakkūttu is generally a drama illustrating stories and incidents from the epics and *purāṇas.*

Page 304, Note 1.

Kuṟi-Eiyiṉi is the name of a Poetess. She belonged to the Kuṟava community.

Ibid. l. 17.

The use of *śuḷaku* or seive in connection with the *kaṭṭu* may be noted. Perhaps the grains were placed in it before the actual counting commenced.

Page 305.

Indra's festival: Neduñjeḻiyaṉ is said to have celebrated a festival in honour of Indra, the God of Rain, to prevent the recurrence of famine in his kingdom as seen by the Larger Śinnamanur plates.

BOOKS CONSULTED

1. Original Sources

Abhidānacintāmaṇi (Madura Śaṅgam edition).
Ācārakkōvai, published by R. Paramasiwan Pillai.
Ahanāṉūṟu, ed. by V. Rājagōpāla Ayyangar.
Ahapporuḷviḷakkam (Madura Śaṅgam publication, 1913).
Aiṅguṟuṉūṟu, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.
Aintiṇai-aimpadu (Madura Śaṅgam). Another edition by Mr. S. S. Desikar (1918).
Aintiṇai eḻupadu, (Madura Śaṅgam). Another edition by S. Somasundara Desikar, (1926).
Annual Reports of South Indian Inscriptions.
Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra—
(i) (Mysore edition).
(ii) *Sacred Books of the East.*
Bhagavadgītā.
Bhāgavata Purāṇa.
Ceylon Antiquary.
Daṇḍi Alaṅkāram, ed. by Kumaraswami Pulavar.
Daṇḍi Kāvyādarśa, ed. by M. Rangācarya, Madras, 1910.
Do. Translation by S. K. Belvalker, Poona, 1924.
Divākaram.
Divyasūricaritam, ed. by Paṇḍit Rangarāmanujadāsan.
Ēlādi, ed. by Paṇḍit Govindarāja Mudaliar. Another edition by the Ripon Press (1924).
Epigraphia Indica.
Fa Hien: A Record of Buddhist Kingdoms, Oxford, 1886.
Guruparamparai.
Iniyavai-nāṟpadu, ed. by R. Rāghava Ayyangar.
Iṉṉā-nāṟpadu, ed. by Paṇḍit Gōvindarāja Mudaliar, Madras, 1922.
Inscriptions of Asoka, ed. by Hultzsch.
Iṟaiyanār Ahapporuḷ, ed. by S. Bavānandam Pillai.
I-tsing: A Record of Buddhist Religion, translated by Takakusu.
Jīvakacintāmaṇi, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.
Kainilai-published by V. Anantarama Aiyar, (Madras).
Kaḷavaḻi-nāṟpadu, ed. by Venkaṭaswāmi Nāṭṭār (Śaiva Siddhānta Works, 1924). Another edition by E. V. Anantarama Aiyar.
Kaḷaviyal-Kārikai, ed. by S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, (Madras).
Kalingattupparaṇi.

Kalittogai, ed. by Dāmōdaram Pillai. Another edition by E. V. Anantarama Aiyar.

Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana.

Kāmandakinītisāra (Trivandrum Sanskrit series).

Kārnārpadu, ed. by Paṇḍit Gōvindarāja Mudaliar, Madras, 1917. Another edition by K. Ramasvami Pillai.

Kauṭalīya Arthaśāstra (Trivandrum Sanskrit series).

Kuruntogai, ed. by Paṇḍit Rangasvāmi Ayyangar of Vāniyambadi.

Mahāvaṁśa, ed. by Wm. Geiger, 1912.

Mahābhārata (Kumbhakonam edition).

Mānavadharmaśāstra, Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay.

Maṇimēkalai, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Mudumoḻikkāñji, ed. by T. Śelvakēśavarāya Mudaliar, Madras, 1919.

Nālaḍiyār, ed. by V. Rājagōpāla Ayyangar, Madras.

Nālayira Divyaprabandham, ed by D. Krisṇamācari, Madras (III Ed.)

Nānmaṇikkaḍigai, ed. by V. Rājagopala Ayyangar, Madras, 1924.

Narriṇai, ed. by P. Nārāyaṇaswāmi Ayyar.

Nīlakēśi, ed. by Professor A. Chakravarti, (Madras, 1936).

Padirruppattu, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Palamoḻināṉūṟu, ed. by T. Śelvakēśavarāya Mudaliar.

Paripāḍal, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Pattuppāṭṭu, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Periya Purāṇam, ed. by Arumuga Nāvalar.

Periya Purāṇavacanam, by Arumuga Nāvalar.

Peruntogai, ed. by M. Rāghava Aiyangar, (Madura Saṅgam, 1936).

Peruṁkatai, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Pingalandi (Ripon Press).

Poruladikāram with commentaries of Nacciṉārkiṉiyar and Pērāśiriyar, published in two parts by S. Kanakasabapati Pillai, (Madras, 1934 and 1935).

Puṟanāṉūṟu, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Puṟapporuḷveṇbāmālai, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.

Rājanītiratnākara (Patna).

Rāmāyaṇa (Kumbhakonam edition).

Sacred Books of Ceylon, Vols. I and II, London.

Śaḍagōparantāṭi, ed. by Sadagōparāmanujacāriar.

Śākuntala of Kālidāsa.

Schoff's Periplus.
Śikālattipurāṇam.
Śilappadikāram, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar (III Ed.).
Śiṟupañcamūlam, ed. by Paṇḍit Ārumugam Servai, Madras, 1923.
Śivaperumāl Tiruvantāti, ed. by Ārumuga Nāvalar, Madras (III Ed.).
South Indian Inscriptions.
Takkayāgapparaṇi, ed by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.
Tamil Lexicon (Madras University).
Tamiḻ Nāvalar Caritam, ed. by T. Kanakasundaram Pillai, 1921.
Tañjai Vāṇan Kōvai, ed. by Tirumayilai Ṣaṇmugam Pillai, 1893.
Tāyumānavar Pāṭal, published by P. Rathna Nayakar & Sons, Madras, 1927.
Tēvāram, ed. by Swāminātha Paṇḍitar.
Tēvārattiraṭṭu of Agattiyar, Longmans, Green & Co., (1916).
Do. ed. by K. Sādāśiva Chettiar (Śaiva Siddhānta Society, 1927.)
Tiṇaimālai-nūṟṟaimpadu, (Madura Saṅgam, 1904).
Tiṇaimoḻi-aimpadu, published by Śaiva Siddhānta Works.
Tirikaḍugam, ed. by Arumuga Navalar, (Madras, 4th edition).
Tirukkōvai (1) published by Sendilvēlu Mudaliar, Madras, (2) ed. by Ārumuga Nāvalar (IV Ed.).
Tirukkōvaiyār Uṇmai, ed. by Swāminātha Paṇḍitar.
Tirukkuṟaḷ, ed. by Arumuga Nāvalar, (XI Ed.).
Tirukkuṟaḷ, (1) ed. by M. Rāghava Ayyangar (1910); (2) Translation by G. U. Pope (Oxford).
Tirumantiram, ed. by M. V. Viswanatha Pillai, (Madras, 1912).
Tiruvādavūraḍigal Purāṇam, Jaffna Edn., 1897.
Tiruvaruḷ-pātirumurai-tiraṭṭu (1) ed. by V. Namasivāya Mudaliar, 1896, (2) ed. by J. M. Kandaswami Pillai, 1924.
Tiruvāymoḻi.
Tiruvāśagam, ed. by G. U. Pope.
Tiruvilaiyāḍal Purāṇam of Nambi, ed. by V. Swāminātha Ayyar.
Tiruvilaiyāḍal Purāṇam of Parāñjōtimunivar.
Tolkāppiyam Ṣeyyuḷiyal, ed. by R. Raghava Ayyangar, 1917.
Tolkāppiyam Eḻuttadikāram, ed. (1) by Vidvān Subbarāya Chettiar, (2) by the Śaiva Siddhānta Works.
Tolkāppiyam Poruḷadikāram, ed. by S. Bavānandam Pillai, Vols. I-IV.
Tolkāppiyam Śolladikāram, ed. (1) by C. R. Namasivāya Mudaliar, (2) by Dāmōdaram Pillai, (3) Tanjore Karandai Edition.

Travancore Archaeological Reports.
Vāsiṣṭha Dharma Śāstra—Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XIV.
Vīramitrōdaya, Chaukhumba Sanskrit Series.

2. Journals

Christian College Magazine, Madras.
Educational Review, The, Madras.
Harisamaya Divākaram, ed. by Rangarāmānujadāsar.
Indian Antiquary, The.
Indian Culture, Calcutta.
Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
Journal of Indian History, Madras.
Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore.
Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
Journal of Royal Asiatic Society, London.
Joural of the Madras University.
Sen Tamiḻ: a Tamil monthly, published by the Madura Tamil Śaṅgam.
Tamilian Antiquary, The.
Tamilian Friend, The.

3. Modern Works

Anavaratavināyakam Pillai, S.—
(i) *Avvaiyār.*
(ii) *Tamil Perumakkal.*
Aravamuthan, T.G., *The Kāvēri, the Maukhari, and the Śaṅgam Age.*
Ayyangar Commemoration Volume, Dr. S. K.
Ayyangar, S. K.—
(i) *Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture* (Calcutta University).
(ii) *Early History of Vaiṣṇavism.*
(iii) *Maṇimēkalai,* in *its Historical setting,* Luzac & Co., 1927.
(iv) *Ancient India.*
(v) *Beginnings of South Indian History.*
(vi) *Evolution of Hindu Administrative Institutions in South India.* ..
Caldwell, *Comparative Dravidian Grammar.*
Das Gupta, *Hindu Mysticism.*
Desikan R. S. and Ranganathan B. L., *Grains of Gold,* (Madras, 1934).

Dikshitar V.R.R., *The Mauryan Polity,* (Madras University).
Do. *Some Aspects of the Vāyupurāṇa.* (Do.).
Do. *Hindu Administrative Institutions,* 1929 (Madras University).
Duraiswāmi, G.S., *Tamil Literature.*
Ganapati Pillai, V., *Māṇikkavāsagar Purāṇam,* (Madras, 1933).
Gōpālan, R., *Pallavas of Kānchi* (Madras University).
Gōpinātha Rao, *History of the Śri Vaiṣṇavas* (Madras University), 1923.
Gōvindacārya, A., *The Holy Lives of Āḻvārs or Dravida Saints* (Mysore), 1902.
Govindarajulu Chetty, T. V., *Śrī Chidambaram Rāmalingaswāmiji,* (1935).
Hooper, J. S. M., *Hymns of the Āḻvārs-Heritage of India Series.*
Inge, W. R., *Christian Mysticism.*
Jayaswal, K. P., *Hindu Polity.*
Kanakasabhai, *Tamils* 1800 *Years Ago.*
Kingsbury, F., and Phillips G.E., *Hymns of Tamil Śaivite Saints-Heritage of India Series.*
Logan, *Malabar,* 2 Vols.
Minakshisundara Mudaliar, P. R., *Tolkāppiyam Śolladikāra-viḷakkam,* (1936).
Do. *An Interpretation of Poruḷadikāram,* (1936).
Narayana Aiyar, C. V., *Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India,* (Madras University, 1936).
Natesan & Co., G. A., Madras, *Appar.*
Natesan & Co., G. A., Madras, *Nammāḻvār.*
Nelson, *Madura District Manual.*
Nilakanta Sastri, K.A., The *Cōḻas* Vol. I., Madras University; *Studies is Cōḻa History and Administration,* (Madras University, 1932).
Do. *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom.*
Oolaganātham Pillai, *Karikālaccōḻan.*
Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (Oxford).
Pillai, S.K., *The Ancient Tamils Part I.*
Popley, H. A., *The Sacred Kuraḷ-Heritage of India Series,* (1931).
Pūrnalingam Pillai, M. S., *A Primer of Tamil Literature.*
Rāghava Ayyangar, M.—
(i) *Āḻvārkaḷ-Kālanilai.*
(ii) *Cēran Seṅguṭṭuvan* (II Ed.)
(iii) *Poruḷadikāra-āraicci* (II Ed.)
Rāghava Ayyangar, R., *Vanjimānagar,* 1917.

Rāghava Ayyangar, M., *Vēḷir Varalāṟu.*
Rāmaswāmi Ayyangar, M. S., *Studies in South Indian Jainism.*
Rāmaswāmi Śāstri, K. S., *Indian AEsthetics*, Sri Vani Vīlas Press, 1927.
Do. *Śaiva Samayācāryas* (Vasanta Book Depot, Madras), 1927.
Swāminātha Ayyar, Mahāmahōpādyāya, *Saṅgattamiḻum Piṟkālat-*

Śēṣa Ayyangar, T. R., *Dravidian India.*
Śēṣagiri Śāstri, *Tamil Literature.*
Sethu Pillai, R. P., *Studies in Tirukkuṟaḷ.*
Sircar, Māhēndranath, *Mysticism in the Bhagavadgīta*, Longmans, 1929.
Sivarāja Pillai, K. N., *Agastya in the Tamil Land* (Madras University).
Do. *The Chronology of the Early Tamils*, (Madras University, 1932).
Somasundara Dēśikar, *Śaivaśikāmaṇikaḷ Iruvar* (1930).
Srinivāsa Ayyangar, M., *Tamil Studies.*
Srinivāsa Ayyangar, P. T.—
(i) *History of the Tamils.*
(ii) *The Stone Age.*
(iii) *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture.*
Srinivāsa Pillai, K. S., *Tamil Varalāṟu.*
Subramaniam, K. R., *Origin of Śaivism* (Madras University).
Subramania Ayyar, K. V., *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan.*
Subrahmanya Sastri, P.S., Dr—
Tolkāppiyam, Vol. I. Eḻuttatikāram, (Madras, 1930).
History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil, (Madras, 1934).
Tamiḻ Moḻinūl, (Trichinopoly, 1936).
Do. *Solladikārakkuṟippu* (1930).
Suryanārayana Śāstri, V. G., *History of Tamil Language*, 1930.
Thurston, *Ethnographic Notes in Southern India.*
Thurston, *Castes and Tribes of South India.*
Vaiyāpuri Pillai, S., *Critical Essays in Tamil.*
Venkatarama Ayyar, C. P., *Town Planning in Ancient Dekhan.*
Venkatarajulu Reddiar, V.—
Kapilar, (Madras University, 1936).
Paraṇar, (Madras University, 1933).
Venkaṭaswami Nāṭṭar—
(i) *Nakkīrar.*
(ii) *Kapilar* (1921).
Warmington, *Commerce between Roman Empire and India.*

INDEX

M

R

U

V

W

Y

Some Select Opinions on the First Edition.

The Times Literary Supplement, London.—The mass of Tamil Literature is considerable, and Mr. Dikshitar is one of the foremost authorities on the subject.

The Indian Antiquary.—Mr. Ramachandra Dikshitar, who is a Lecturer in Indian History in the University of Madras handles the literary and traditional evidence with discrimination and good sense.

Journal of the American Oriental Society.—He has produced a useful book and thrown needed light on a dark spot in Indian History.

The Modern Review.—This is a good scholarly set of studies for which the interested public will remain grateful to the author; and we hope more such studies will come from the author's pen and let us hope, editions and translations of some specimens at least of Śaṅgam literature.

The Pioneer, Allahabad.—In this volume Mr. Dikshitar sustains the reputation he made as the author of 'Hindu Administrative Institutions.'

Dr. A. Berriedale Keith, University of Edinburgh.—I have read with great interest your work and in special the chapters on administration, the art of war and social life. They are very attractively written and ensure a cordial reception of your new work.

Prof. Dr. Jules Bloch in his letter, dated 11—3—1931. "I just met Prof. S. Lēvi who told me that his first impression of the book was very favourable; he had seen in particular the mention relating to Maṇimekalai on which he has recently published a paper. As regards me, I propose to read the book fully as I see I have so much to learn from it.

Dewan Bahadur Dr. S. K. Aiyangar.—He brings to work the wide outlook and intensive study which he has shown elsewhere and the work covers a wide range of topics relating to the history and culture of the Tamils. I have no doubt it will prove a contribution of considerable importance to the study of South Indian literature.

Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar.—(Now Principal, Benares Hindu University): Let me congratulate you most warmly on its excellence considered as a piece of historical writing, I have honestly enjoyed reading it. Monographs on Tamil History and Literature have often been confused, pedantic and tedious. You have successfully avoided these defects. You have mastered your material and have not been mastered by it, with the result that one can find in almost every page of your book evidence of your wide reading as well as of your gifts of clear vision, acute criticism and balanced judgement. Your great knowledge of both Tamil and Sanskrit has given you an unique advantage over most of those who have hitherto written on South Indian Literature and History.

Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar, Trivandrum.—I regard your book as a most important contribution to the study of ancient Tamil literature and history. I wonder how a

Sanskritist like you was able to come by the wealth of material, which you have so well utilised and presented, so as to yield valuable results regarding the culture and polity of the early Tamils. You have studied your literary materials with sympathetic interest; and throughout the book your broad outlook, keen perception of essentials and a fair historic sense are present. Once again let me congratulate you on the excellence of your work.

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.